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Reviewer's report:

It is clear that the authors have put in a lot of effort in revising this manuscript, although the manuscript still requires revisions.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   - No – Although the manuscript starts with a clear definition of neglect it does not build on earlier Chinese research? Several Chinese studies are now mentioned in the introduction without the author is addressing how they are building on this knowledge. It would be useful to have some discussion regarding the cultural appropriateness of the SCNUC and other potential strengths and limitations. In addition, some researchers have reported on neglect correlates (14-18) – what did they find? Similarly one-child and multiple-child families differ in their neglect exposure (18) – how? Usually the introduction includes an explanation what we know about a topic, what’s left to discover and what the present research will add.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   - Yes in general and the analysis has improved from the last iteration. However, the attachment that was mentioned in previous version of the manuscript and in this version was not available to me. More importantly there is no mention on how data linkage was conducted.

3. Are the data sound?
   - The presentation of the data has improved.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting the data?
   - Yes. However, was their any co-occurrence of the various types of neglect?

5. Are the discussion and conclusion well balanced and adequately supported?
   - No as pointed out in my previous review child protection data from the United States can hardly be appropriate comparison to the author’s results. Furthermore, it would be useful if the comparisons were addressed more succinctly. It would be helpful to start with the comparison of overall prevalence estimates, than the sub types and finally discuss the correlates in the context of existing comparable literature.
6. Are the limitations of the work clearly stated?
- I am pleased that the authors added text regarding my previous comment on social desirability responses. Thanks!

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
- No, see comments for the introduction.

8. Does the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
- Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
- No. The Manuscript requires language editing before publication. In addition, to grammatical errors the authors need to read the manuscript carefully. For instance, in the introduction, the risk correlates of neglect are missing direction, maternal age is not a risk correlate – young age should be specified. The same issue needs to be addressed for maternal education etc.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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