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Reviewer’s report:

I am not convinced the authors have adequately addressed the concerns raised. Here are some examples:

1. The issue with the response rate is not power but bias. A low response rate will be biased and there needs to be a much more detailed discussion on the implications of this bias in the limitations section.

2. The differential response rate also suggests bias. The authors response that "We expect the lower response rate for school professionals in the triage group may have offset the differences between the two groups." suggests that they do not understand the issues of bias and the issues this has for their conclusions.

3. These issues mean that their conclusions are still too strongly worded

4. Whilst the authors have defended the international interest of this paper, they need to discuss how the implications may differ in countries that do not have similar systems and not just defend generic changes in health care reforms. Or state, that the results are only of interest to countries with the following types of screening methods.

Minor comments

the use of new abbreviations throughout make the paper very difficult to read.

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.
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 recommend additional statistical review

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