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Reviewer’s report:

In general the authors of this manuscript responded well to the previous criticisms. With minor edits, and a good review of the manuscript for grammatical and sentence structure corrections, I recommend its publication.

For the sake of brevity, I am including my recommended minor edits here and answered the other standard questions about the manuscript below.

Minor essential revisions:
Page 3- Abstract- add (CHPs) after: Child healthcare professionals; Page 5, four line change 'so' for 'them'
Page 5, middle of second paragraph: ‘The psychometric properties...’ needs rewriting as it is unclear Page 5,2nd sentence needs rewriting: 'We compared...'
Page 6, some where in the method section needs to be stated that the study had ethics approval by the required boards.
Page 6, ramdomization rationale is repeated twice (set of questionnaires would become too long). The reader wanders why the SDQ (with only 25 items) was chosen for randomization instead of the ASQ:SE (with either 31 or 33 items), which is slightly longer; is it because the psychometric properties of the ASQ have not been tested in the Netherlands? If this is the case it should be stated.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? yes
3. Are the data sound? yes
4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation? yes
5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? yes
6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? yes
7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? yes
8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? N/A
9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? yes
10. Is the writing acceptable?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance 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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