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Report.
A review on the manuscript: Parental academic involvement in adolescence predicts mental health trajectories over the life course: A prospective population-based cohort study.
Reviewer: Hrefna Pálsdóttir

1. Discretionary Revisions

• It could be clearer to have the abstract more limited or separate it a little from the main text - also have it shorter - only few line on each topic.

• Line 80: Is Background better?

2. Minor Essential Revisions:

• Lines: 120 – 122: These statements need a stronger and better arguments or stronger reference.

• You need to have the reference like this: [8,17,25].

3. Major Compulsory Revisions

• Line 131: It would be clearer to describe the “aim of the study” better.

• The research question is missing but you mention “your main hypothesis” (line 132). Is there another one? You should mention that.

• The Method chapter is unclear to me. In line 140: It could be clearer to call it: Sample instead of Population?

• It is mentioned that this study is a “prospective study” (line: 141) – Can you describe what that is og why you use it? You also mention an interview with teachers the year 1983 (line 147). Did you not interview any teachers again? Why did you just do it once and not again? Do you think of your study as just a quantitative one, or is it also a qualitative one?

• You should also have the Procedure chapter clearer. You could mention: Where did the students fill out the survey questionnaires? Did a teacher or somebody else assist the students when filling it out? What did the students do with the questionnaires after they had filled them out? Was it anonymous questionnaire?
• In the Measurement chapter or the Measures: You could describe better The latent class growth analysis or the (LCGA) and how you use it and why?
• Lines: 196-214 are very unclear and confusing to me. This needs a clearer explanation.
• In the Results chapter: Line: 257-265. Like I mentioned before, this is a little confusing and needs a better explanation.

Strengths:
• The present study is time serial study or a prospective study.
• The participants are representative
• The sample is rather big.

Weaknesses:
• The statistical analysis or the measures/models are unclear and confusing to me.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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