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Author’s response to reviews:

Again, we would like to thank the reviewers for their detailed and thoughtful insightful comments. We have addressed each comment by answering it directly herein and made the appropriate changes in the manuscript. All changes in the text are highlighted in red font.

Reviewer 1: Louise Brough (Reviewer 1): I am still concerned the authors are overstating their results. In my initial review I suggested the authors state that this is not a representative sample. the authors rebutted this stating they did not agree as the breastfeeding distributions may be representative. However, the authors themselves state "the distribution of socio-economic characteristics was not representative of the larger population" also they are recruited solely via the internet. I do not agree this should be left to the end of the discussion, the fact the sample is not representative needs to be made clear early in the discussion (not at the end), and also in the abstract.

We have noted that the sample was a convenience sample both in the abstract and in the second paragraph of the discussion added:

“while the sample was not representative”. Reviewer 3 Karen Cowgill (Reviewer 3): Thank you for your comprehensive response to the comments. The manuscript is clearer, although there are still some minor points I suggest addressing:

1. Needs copy editing for sentences starting with numbers that are not spelled out, many typos

Thank you for this detailed read of the text. We have corrected the sentences starting with numbers and the typos.
2. I'm still concerned that the authors refer to "a sample of 271", implying that it was selected, rather than saying that this was a convenience sample, internet-based survey.

We noted that was a convenience sample in the abstract and early in the discussion, per the request of reviewer 1.

3. Authors have still not phrased interpretation of the Bayes’ Factor clearly

We have attempted to further clarify the description of the Bayes Factor tool. This is the amended description:

JASP V0.9 was used for Bayesian testing to quantify evidence for the null (H0) and alternative (H1) hypotheses. The Bayesian approach to hypothesis testing considers the likelihood of the data under each hypothesis, allowing inference regarding the strength of the evidence. The statistic for comparing the probability of a set of observed data under two models is termed the Bayes Factor (BF). The nomenclature used is BF10, representing the odds for H1, or 1/BF10 (BF01), representing the odds for null hypothesis. BF10 < 0.33 provides strong or ‘substantial’ evidence for the null hypothesis, over 3 provides strong evidence for the alternative hypothesis and between 0.33 and 3 provides only anecdotal support either way [37]. Thus, this analytical tool allows to infer the validity of the null hypothesis above and beyond the uncertainty of a non-significant value (i.e., insufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis).

4. Legend for Table 2 -- please specify if this shows mean (sd)

This has been added, thank you.