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Reviewer's report:

This paper examines links between child anxiety and depression and emotion regulation reported by mothers and fathers in a medium sized Norwegian sample. Anxiety symptoms were similarly related to emotion regulation as reported by mothers and fathers but in depression the link to emotion regulation was stronger when father report was analysed.

This study benefits from a number of strengths including addressing a question of interest to the journal readership, multi-informant data and a well-written manuscript.

Background

The introduction provides a clear and helpful introduction to the concept of emotion regulation and to differences between parent informers. This focuses nicely onto the analyses to be presented.

Further coverage would be helpful, however on the validity of parent and child reports of psychopathology, to provide a stronger context for the interpretation of the results that differ between parent and child report reports. This discussion should also induce the issue of common method variance in the context of identifying correlates of psychopathology.

The first two paragraphs should be included under the sub-heading of Emotion regulation, anxiety and depression, ideally amalgamated into one paragraph.

Method

p<.001 not p<.000

EASQ please comment on the reliability of this measure or explain why you believe reliability is not relevant to this scale.

P10 Line 35. I am not clear how the univariate regressions provide different information from the correlation of the outcome and predictor as included in the correlation results.
Please explain the Paternoster test in more detail.

Results

P11 line 38, 'surely it should be p>.05 for the correlation coefficient estimated at .00?

Discussion

P13 Line 36 the suggestion that emotion regulation strategies are a target for intervention needs to be more explicitly tempered with the consideration of the cross-sectional data limitations that are detailed in the paragraph below.

'P14 para 2. The limitation of the current sample relative to a clinical sample is discussed. I would also be interested in hearing the authors’ thoughts on how well they think the results from the current sample would generalise to a fully random general population sample.

P14 Line 50. The issue of whether child or parent provides the most accurate report of psychopathology does not seem to me to be the main concern. For me the most important question is whether each provides clinically useful information. My reading of the literature including the work cited here, is that they do. So this might be a useful point to make here.

P14 Line 55/57 I don't quite understand how the pattern of results support validity. I would like the authors to re-write this for clarity. The issues of common method variance needs to be discussed, as relationships between constructs from the same reporter seem to be inflated relative to associations between constructs across different raters.

P15 Line 5. I don't agree that the finding that there being no difference in the strength of links between mother and father reports in prediction strength indicates that there is no value in taking ratings from both. This point would only be tested in a model where both mother and father reports were included as simultaneous predictors.

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