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Reviewer's report:

The revisions have significantly improved the manuscript. I have only two small comments and would like to ask the authors to respond.

It would be desirable to conclude by saying that one of the three important functions of the SEE, namely the epidemiological function, can no longer be implemented with the chosen approach. That would clearly be an important limitation for me.

The other note refers once again to the operationalisation of the variable migration background. Here, too, one should think about whether it would not make sense to define this variable differently in the future?

For me, another general problem arises in another area: It is about the availability of information, i.e. also medical, psychological and pedagogical findings on the development history of children, which are not always available to the school doctor in a complete or networked form, so that for this reason children can possibly be "overlooked". But it opens a new keg.

I should therefore simply like to ask you to return to the two points mentioned above.

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?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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