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Reviewer’s report:

Review of BMC International Health & Human Rights manuscript “Child neglect in one-child family from Suzhou City of Mainland China.”

Overall the revised manuscript is improved. However, there are still some issues that need to be addressed.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. The study still needs stronger theoretical justification in the introduction. You mention that Zhang et al reported a difference between one-child and multiple-child families, but you don’t say what the direction was. Were one-child families characterized by lower neglect in this study? More detail about your expectations is required. For example, why did you choose to focus on one-child families and what did you expect to find with respect to the rates of neglect and predictors of neglect in these families? Would you expect the correlates of neglect found in other studies to be similar in this sample, or are there unique factors associated with neglect in one-child families? The introduction still needs to be fleshed out more.

2. Still more information is needed to interpret the cut-off scores for neglect subtypes. I see that the cut-points were based on national norms, but that doesn’t tell me how those cut-points were determined. Were they the sample means from the Pan study? One standard deviation above the mean? Were the cutoff scores validated in Pan’s study (e.g., did neglectful parents have children with worse outcomes?). Because the Pan article is in Chinese, you will need to more thoroughly explain how these cutoff scores were derived for an English audience so that readers can interpret the rates of neglect in this sample.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. The language/grammar could still use attention. There are still issues with missing or extra articles and subject-verb agreement.

2. The first paragraph of the results mentions medical neglect. It appears that medical neglect is no longer being included in this manuscript, so please remove it. Please also check the means and standard deviations in this paragraph and fix the formatting (i.e., SD = ###, range = ## to ##).

3. It is unclear to me why school, child age, and gender and the only
characteristics included in Table 2. I would drop Table 2, but if you decided to keep it, the Table should include all characteristics and discuss them in more depth. Also, drop medical neglect from Table 2.

Discretionary Revisions:

1. I would like to see post-hoc tests for the significant ANOVAS in Table 1. Without them it’s hard to tell which means are different.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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