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Reviewer's report:

The rationale for this manuscript is the mixed findings with respect to the increase over time across cohorts for internalizing symptoms, with a special focus on boys, given the literature is clearer with respect to girls. The design and results of the current manuscript do not really contribute to clarification of these mixed findings, and thus the manuscript makes only a small contribution to the literature in terms of adding more inconsistent results, albeit using a large sample with well-validated measures.

I have a few substantial queries for the authors to address:

1. Are there any predictors of non-involvement in the sample, that can explain why 40% did not respond?

2. Why rely only on the cut-off for SDQ, could not a total score be examined using linear regression? Dichotomization, whilst suitable for comparison, does decrease power.

3. Can the authors provide other and more reliable, indicators of internal consistency for their measures, such as a H coefficient?

4. Table 2: the R2 for sMFQ is not very informative? is there a more informative statistic?

5. Were any of the statistics corrected for correlated data (twin correlations)? it may be necessary to look at Twin 1 and 2 separately.

6. Throughout the manuscript there is too much reliance on p values, report ES and 95% CI instead.
Minor issues:

1. Page 3, line 34: The word "international" is not required; more informative would be across how many countries have studied been conducted?

2. Pag4, lines 5-10: A single sentence does not make a paragraph - please join this to the previous paragraph.

3. Page 7, line 5: a comma is missing

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.

Yes

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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