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Reviewer's report:

The introduction provides a concise and clear background on the relevant literature and proposes a sensible research question to investigate.

Sampling method is clearly described.

I am unsure why the authors transformed the continuously measured score of anxiety into a binary score, and what justification they had for using 4 as the criteria for identifying "high" and "not high" scores. What is the rationale for dichotomizing a continuously measured construct? Same applies for Depression. It appears parental depression was not categorized; why was the decision made to categorize child psychopathology but not parental psychopathology?

Why did the authors run a logistic regression instead of a multiple regression treating the criterion variables as continuous? Also, what is the rationale for removing non-significant predictors from the original model? This is inappropriate as you are merely fitting the model to your data. Non-significant factors in a model are as valuable as significant predictors as it represents critical information.

The decisions made regarding the analytical strategy are problematic and without reasonable justification. What would the results have looked like if the authors treated the criterion variables as continuous variables? What would the results have looked like if the authors had selected an alternative cut-off score to four? These decisions, which have not been satisfactorily explained, lead to much concern about the stability of these findings.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
No

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:
Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.