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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for asking me to take a look at this revised paper

The authors have addressed many of the points raised by myself and the other reviewer.

They still need to (essential revisions):

Add to /amend the ABSTRACT as follows

1. Methods:
   add: that the population was identified by screening using the SDQ (cut point ..)

2. Results:
   Add: 81 families were recruited and randomised and 67 provided post intervention data
   3. Amend the sentence starting 'None of the differences ...............This is not true.
      It needs to say 'none of the differences on the primary or secondary outcomes were significant. Only one comparison (SDQ conduct score) out of nn (authors to add) was significant in the subsidiary analyses.

Conclusions

4. Add: that the study was underpowered.

In the main text two points need addressing in the DISCUSSION

5. The authors need to amend the text of the discussion on Page 13 where they discuss the trial being underpowered. If a trial is underpowered the precision of the estimate of effect is reduced - so the estimate of 1.94 is not reliable; the real effect could be bigger or smaller. I suggest this sentence is deleted

6. The issue of external validity that I raised in my initial review is still not addressed and needs to be. The level of recruitment to the trial was low. The chances that families who took part were the same as those who refused is on the face of it unlikely. This compromises the application of the results of the trial to the general population of screen detected families/children.

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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