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Reviewer's report:

The authors have responded well to my (and other reviewers') previous comments on the first version of the manuscript. I want to congratulate them in submitting a much improved paper. It is now clearer and more coherent, better structured, rendering its contribution to the scientific literature even more convincing. At this stage, I think that the paper is close to a publishable state, and therefore I only have a few more (minor) comments:

1- There are still some typographical errors in the manuscript. The manuscript should be revised thoroughly to delete these.

2- This sentence should be revised: "...the mathematical achievement scores decreased over time, showing an increase in lifetime mathematical disability is association a lower school achievements later in life [26, 40, 41]."

3- Page 12, High Quality Rating studies section: There is some confusion regarding the number of studies. Authors first say that 19 out of 24 studies show a significant relation between ADHD and math. They then identify 3 other studies not included in the previously listed 19 (studies 30, 39 and 55). It seems that study 39 is a medium quality study (see Table 1). After, they say that 4 of the 24 studies did not show a significant relation between ADHD and math, which doesn't add up. In addition, they identify not four but 3 studies (43-45). In short, this section needs to be revised and clarified so that it is coherent with Table 1 and the following section on medium quality studies.

4- When discussing genetically informed studies, environmental correlations should also be identified using rc abbreviation, as it is for genetic correlations (ra).

5- I can't find where in the discussion the need for more longitudinal studies is mentioned as a future direction, nor where the lack of longitudinal studies in the review is specified as a limitation in the limitations section (see my comments on version 1 of the paper). These two observations need to be mentioned more clearly.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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