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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors have done a good job in responding to my prior comments. There are just a couple of minor essential revisions remaining.

1. Number of significant digits. Two decimal points are sufficient for odds ratios and confidence intervals in the text, tables, and figure. More than that implies a greater degree of precision than is actually present. You may want to round to three decimal points for the p values.

2. The results in the abstract and on pages 17 and 19 of the text should place greater emphasis on the magnitude of the odds ratio. For example, the abstract should state "The two states with lead laws, MA and OH were 79% less likely than the one without legislation....." Also, the text on page 17 should state "Unadjusted estimates showed that the lead-law states were 43% less likely...... After controlling for covariates including......lead-law states were 79% less likely to identify subsequent cases of lead poisoning. Both unadjusted and adjusted results were statistically significant." It's quite impressive that the association became stronger after confounders were taken into account; this fact is lost if you just emphasize statistical significance. You can still give the ORs and 95% CIs in these sections.

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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