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Dear Mr Aulakh:

We are pleased to submit this revised manuscript in response to the reviewers’ critiques. We believe we have been able to respond to their criticisms and that the paper has been strengthened as a result of their input.

**Reviewer 1**

1. We have changed “preventative” to preventive throughout
2. We fixed the spelling error
3. We changed it to fabric of lives…
4. We have added some discussion regarding implications for parents and pediatricians
5. We agree that this is a limitation regarding generalizability and state so in our discussion. It should be noted that although the sampling strategy might bias our findings, it is unclear in which direction that bias might go (if at all). Furthermore, we now cite a systematic review that we have in press that found that all existing studies of US youth have significantly biased samples. We have removed the word representative where applicable.
6. We gave added verbiage that the interaction with depression which is common in US college students should heighten interest of college administrators.

**Reviewer 2**

1. We explained our use of IRR and defined it
2. Future studies are needed as we now state
3. We used a cut off point based on prior validation studies we now cite.
4. We have tempered the final sentence. It is a possible implication. Reviewer 1 urged us to say even more.

**Reviewer 3 & 4**

Poisson regression can be used in situations as we have described. We did in fact dichotomize our outcome as 0 or 1. The issue was just that logistic regression provides an OR which does not estimate a RR very accurately when the outcome is common as ours is. We now cite references (including one in the BMC series) that empirically validated its appropriateness in such situations.
Reviewer 4

1. See reviewer 3 comments
2. We did not do a prior power calculations as this was an exploratory study
3. We now describe what the IRR represents
4. If the editor would prefer, we can provide these numbers
5. We have added details to the methods, although they are relatively straightforward.
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