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Author’s response to reviews:

REVIEWER/EDITOR COMMENT: It would be helpful to insert 'childhood' before 'intervention' in the title.

RESPONSE: Done (p. 1, line 1)

REVIEWER/EDITOR COMMENT: Page 3 line 92 insert 'they' after 'but'.

RESPONSE: Done

REVIEWER/EDITOR COMMENT: Page 9 line 236 insert 'and' before 'provided'.

RESPONSE: Done

REVIEWER/EDITOR COMMENT: Table 3 please replace 'ref' by 'reference category' in the relevant cells.

RESPONSE: Done
REVIEWER/EDITOR COMMENT: Please remove page 11 lines 279-283 to Data Analysis section as they concern the analysis.

RESPONSE: Done

REVIEWER/EDITOR COMMENT: Please move p.12 lines 309-315 to Results section under Aim 2 as they are results.

RESPONSE: Done

REVIEWER/EDITOR COMMENT: Please explain the use of R squared in the methods section and also how the model fits were assessed eg checking normality of residuals via residual plots.

RESPONSE: Done

REVIEWER/EDITOR COMMENT: Please change the word 'correlates' in the headings/subheadings on page 15 as the multiple regression is not looking at correlation but associations (on average) between explanatory variables and the dependent variable which are being modelled as means. Either just delete or replace with 'association', and in Table 3 title.

RESPONSE: We opted for "Factors associated with..."

REVIEWER/EDITOR COMMENT: It would be helpful to fully interpret the first set of results clearly eg. for a one unit increase in EI intensity score the average child involvement score reduced by xx units (giving names of scales in brackets).

RESPONSE: Done

REVIEWER/EDITOR COMMENT: Please make sure that Table 3 can be fully read (remove the formatting comments).

RESPONSE: Thanks for the opportunity to check this. We have done this to confirm that it can be fully read. Done

REVIEWER/EDITOR COMMENT: In Table 1 please make the heading 'Number (%)' to indicate what is being presented (n=37 can also remain).

RESPONSE: Sure, this is done
REVIEWER/EDITOR COMMENT: Please insert a rationale for the sample size before the Data Analysis section, headed Sample size. A calculation is not required but some rationale for the target sample size that was aimed for and what the target was.

RESPONSE: Sure, this is done

REVIEWER/EDITOR COMMENT: Are the results on page 16 lines 383-385 regarding the greater the EI the less participation counter-intuitive? And in the Discussion on lines 450-454? Please check these results and provide some possible explanation in the discussion.

RESPONSE: The results are correct and now interpreted.