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Vietnam bullying

This study reports on the associations of parent-child relationship and factor relating to child mental well being (bullying, victimisation, loneliness, suicidal ideation) in a large Vietnamese sample.

The paper is well written and the geographical location of the sample makes the study of interest to readers who are more used to reading research from Europe and USA.

I do have two serious concerns about the ms, however.

The data collected are cross-sectional, but the results are interpreted with a strong causal framework of parenting relationship influencing wellbeing. This cannot be assumed. It is equally possible that mental health might impact upon parent-child relationship, for example. The ms needs to be re-written to only discuss associations rather than causal relationships. The discussion may then speculate on the causal mechanisms that might underlie these observed associations.

The measurement of the key variables of the study is based on only single items. This is a weakness in that multi-item scales would improve reliability. Furthermore, the use of validated scales would have increased confidence that the measurements adopted effectively measure the concepts that the authors assume that they are measuring. Further still, in some cases items have been combined together on the basis of subjective opinion, so far as I can see, and the chosen combinations may not be optimal. For example, see the discussion of the bonding construct below. More psychometric justification of the measures used, and especially of the combining of items as used here, is required in this write-up.
The following specific points came to my mind as I was reading the manuscript.

p3 line 40. "Bullying behaviors differ between sexes, ethic groups” This point needs to be expanded to be meaningful, or to be deleted.

p3 line 58 intermediate not intermedia

The parental monitoring question does not seem core to the bonding construct. It seems more like control.

Results

Clarify aOR in the text on first use.

The odds ratios change little between unadjusted and adjusted models. I was surprised by this as I assumed there would be some correlations between predictors. Please comment on this and provide details of the correlations between predictors in the manuscript.

Table 2. Clarify what the bold coefficients mean and ensure this rule has been applied consistently.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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 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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