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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Yes - current version is technically sound

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: I thought the authors did very well to answer my comments, including proof reading the manuscript. The paper is technically sound and I have only a few more grammatical errors to correct.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Abstract:
- Page 3, Lines 32-33: "We used the logistic regression model" should be "We used logistic regression"

Introduction:
- Page 5, Line 54: "varied widely" should be "varies widely"
- Page 6, Line 74: "have increased" should be "increases"
- Page 6, Line 78: "positive association" should be "positive associations"
- Page 6, Line 84: "banned smoke" should be "banned smoking"
- Page 6, Line 91: "from Chinese" should be "from the Chinese"

Methods
- Page 7, Line 102: "Grade" should be "grades"
- Page 8, Line 115: "conducted" should be "collected"
- Page 9, Line 134: "presences" should be "presence"
- Page 9, Line 145: "linear trend" should be "linear trends"
Results

- Page 11, Line 190: "total SDQ" should be "total SDQ score"
- Page 12, Line 197: "remain" should be "remained"

Discussion

- Page 13, Line 216: delete "and with" and start a new sentence with "two"
- Page 13, Line 22: "exposure" should be "exposed"
- Page 13, Line 228: "was" should be "is"
- Page 13, Line 231: "level" should be "levels"
- Page 13, Line 231: "underestimate" should be "underestimation"
- Page 14, Line 236: "by questionnaire of SDQ" should be "by questionnaires"
- Page 14, Line 238: "good predictor" should be "a good predictor"
- Page 14, Line 246: "is cross-sectional" should be "are cross-sectional", and "couldn't" should be "could not"
- Page 14, Line 255: "pretty lower" should be "very low"
- Page 15, Line 262: "n utero" should be "in utero"
- Page 15, Line 262: "from workplace" should be "from the workplace"
- Page 15, Line 270: "exerts" should be "exert"
- Page 15, Line 271: "arear" should be "areas", and "mediate" should be "mediates"
- Page 15, Line 272: "activate and desensitize" should be "activating and desensitizing"
- Page 15, Line 273: "child's brain is" should be "children's brains are"
- Page 15, Line 274: "which is" should be "which are"
- Page 15, Line 275: "system" should be "systems"
- Page 15, Line 277: "receptor" should be "receptors", and "can affect" should be "can affect the"
- Page 16, Line 279: "in prefrontal" should be "in the prefrontal"
- Page 16, Line 286: "for child's" should be "for a child's"
- Page 17, Line 299: delete "the"
- Page 17, Line 301: "strict" should be "restrict"

Other
- Page 18, Line 308: "world health organization" should be "World Health Organization", and "strengths and difficulties questionnaire" should be "Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire"

Finally, please double check the references. "The Lancet" should be "Lancet", "BMJ open" should be "BMJ Open", etc. Check for consistency in abbreviation.

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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