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Dear Editor.

Thank you for the comments from you and the reviewer and for your encouragement to again submit a revised version of our manuscript “Prevalence of suspected developmental delays in early infancy: results from a regional population-based longitudinal study”.

We have done our best to attend to the concerns both in the enclosed cover letter as well in the revised manuscript.

Our response to the reviewer’s comments are attached below.

We hope that the changes and clarifications provided in this revision have improved the manuscript and that it is acceptable for publication in BMC Pediatrics.

Looking forward to hearing your decision.

Sincerely,

Lisbeth Valla
Response to the reviewers’ comments

Reviewer # 1
Comment 1: Several language grammatical errors remain and should be addressed prior to publication.

Response: The article has now been checked for grammar and spelling mistakes and we hope that this has contributed substantially to improve the entire English text.

Reviewer # 1
Comment 2: suggest changing text on p 4 lines 102-103 to “One of the validated screening tools recommended by the American Academy of Pediatrics is the Ages and Stages Questionnaires

Response: This has now been completed

Reviewer # 1
Comment 3: The clarity of the last sentence on p 5 that describes the study’s aims could be improved specifically the phrase regarding associations of SDD.

Response: We have now made it explicit that the aim was to investigate and not estimate these associations.

Reviewer # 1
Comment 4: Please include a definition for footnote ”a”. Also, please consider spelling out the word ”prevalence” to improve clarity.

Response: We have explained the abbreviation prev. for prevalence, in footnote a, however it is not place to spell out the word within the table.
Reviewer # 1
Comment 5: Consider summarizing the information on lines 282-287 on p. 11 as that level of detail may not be needed in the manuscript.

Response:
We have now shortened the information in the manuscript in lines 282-287 in the previous version.

Editor's comment:
Can you confirm the full name of the Research Ethics Committee that approved the study

Response: We confirm that the full name on the Research ethics Committee is: The Norwegian Regional Committee for Medical and Health Ethics, Eastern and Southern Norway.