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Reviewer's report:

This is a well conducted and well written study based on representative national data base.

I only have minor comments:

- what do you mean by 'robust standard errors were applied to account for interdependence due to siblings...’?

In case of non-independence of the individuals, the standard way to proceed is to use specific methods such as mixed models or GEE models to account for that kind of structures.

Can you please explain how your method account for that?

- why don't you test the difference of the OR obtained for example when you stratify for the age at split-up? There are simple formulas to calculate the corresponding p-values..

I understand that given your sample size, you will easily reach statistically significance, but that might strengthen your message..

- could you please detail how do you ensure that your exposure precede the measure of the outcome, notably for the analysis for age 9-12 when you stratify?

- have you tested interactions between your exposure and the socio economic related variables?

- do the school performance are available? It could be interesting to test whether the school performance of the children (probably highly associate with the outcome) at the time of split up modify the relationship with social well being...
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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