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Dear Dr Aarons,

We were very pleased to read about your positive view on our paper. Below, please find our responses to the two minor changes you recommended us to do.

Your comment 1: First, please revise Table 2 to include only those models that you mention in the text of the manuscript (i.e., robust ML and robust WLS). Demonstrating the congruence of those models should be enough to convince readers that your results are consistent when utilizing different estimators.

We found this to be a tricky issue and would like to suggest that all models included in Table 2 should remain as we are referring to all these models in the manuscript text. The two first analyses (ML\textsuperscript{a} and ML\textsuperscript{a,b}) are about the linear quadratic effect and are described for each research use measure in the results section. The third and fourth analyses (MLR\textsuperscript{a} and WLS\textsuperscript{a}) are reported under stability of results, which now also is made clearer in the manuscript (see highlighted text on page 17). The 5\textsuperscript{th} analysis (ML\textsuperscript{a}) shows the results when only including those with complete RU data from all five data collections and these findings are described in the section on stability of results and also discussed in the discussion section. The 6\textsuperscript{th} analysis (ML\textsuperscript{ad}) is about freeing the second data collection from being included in the linear model. It is reported in the section about stability of results and also discussed in the discussion section. To conclude, removing any of the analyses from Table 2 also imply that we need to make changes in the text. We are uncertain about doing that as you indicate that we should keep the analyses that are mentioned in the text. We would be grateful if you could assist with guidance on this issue.

Your comment 2: Second, please provide a citation for the statement on page 12 that "...no further control for the impact of educational institutions was needed when estimating the effects and sources of individual differences in longitudinal growth." A couple of appropriate references would be from Kreft & de Leeuw (1998) and Snijders & Bosker (1999), however there may be other more current references that you would prefer to cite. Please make the appropriate changes and return your revised manuscript.

We have added Heck, R H & Thomas, S L (2009): An introduction to multilevel modeling techniques. 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. New York: Routledge as a citation for this statement while it is a current and relevant reference.