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Reviewer #2:

Comment: Thank you for submitting a revised version of your scoping review manuscript. Please, consider the following additional (minor) comments before acceptance.

Response: Thank you kindly. We hope we have adequately addressed your comments in the revised manuscript.

Comment: Abstract. Page 2. Background. Line 21. The authors state: "To address this need this research to practice gap this study aimed to (…)" Please, revise this sentence. For example: "To address this knowledge gap, this study aimed to (…)".

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We have revised the manuscript to reflect these changes in the following manner: To address this knowledge gap, this study aimed to report on the landscape of research pertaining to mental health interventions for infants and preschoolers (0-5 years), and their families at-risk for socio-emotional difficulties and negative developmental outcomes.
Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We have revised the manuscript accordingly in the following manner: A scoping review methodology was used to conduct a large scale mapping of the intervention research pertaining to infants and preschoolers (0-5) at-risk for socio-emotional difficulties. We searched MEDLINE, PsycINFO, EMBASE, Web of Science, The Cochrane Library, CINAHL, LILACS, ProQuest Nursing & Allied Health Source, World Cat and ClinicalTrials.gov, from inception to December 31, 2012.

Response: Thank you for the suggestion. We have deleted that segment of the abstract as follows: We extracted information regarding publication date, geographical location, study design, level of risk, population, key intervention mechanism and outcome measures.

Response: Thank you. We have edited the manuscript as follows: The methods for this scoping review were informed by the six-step procedure outlined by Daudt, van Mossel and Scott [27], an extension of Arksey and O’Malley’s [24] approach and reported following PRISMA statement extension for scoping reviews [210] (Additional file 1).

Response: We have deleted this sentence from the manuscript as per your suggestion. Thank you. Thank you for the suggestion.

Response: We appreciate this suggestion and have edited the manuscript accordingly: Our hand search confirmed the upward trend continues for intervention research to be conducted with this vulnerable population by identify 39 new studies [212-250].
Comment: Results. Page 34. Results. Flow diagram should report reasons for exclusions of 371 records. Please, revise.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have edited the PRISMA diagram to include the rationale for exclusion as follows: 371 studies were excluded with reasons including 330 that did not satisfy inclusion criteria such as samples comprised of children older than 0-5 years and/or those primarily diagnosed with autism and studies not focused on interventions; 24 were not accessible to the researchers including non-English language publications; 13 articles provided insufficient description of their research methodologies to be considered; 2 were duplicate studies not previously identified; and 2 were conference abstracts providing insufficient detail to be included.