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Reviewer's report:

The authors have done a good job responding to the reviewer comments. I would still urge the authors to go through one more time and make very certain that they provide as much guidance as possible about how the instrument should or should not be used. For predictive validity, the sensitivity for detecting ASD and ADHD is very low. For the combined ASD sample (both previous and predictive), only a little more than half of kids with ASD were identified with the A-TAC). This just does not really seem acceptable for a screener. The ability to identify children with previous diagnoses was much better (more than "slightly better" as is currently stated in the discussion). Thus, I would think that the authors might want to provide a little bit more guidance about situations in which the A-TAC might not be an appropriate choice of screener given the low sensitivity. Any information about which children were particularly likely to not be captured by the instrument would also be helpful.
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