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Author’s response to reviews:

Once again we would like to thank the Editor for providing thoughtful and valuable feedback on our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript accordingly and changes have been highlighted using track changes. We describe how we have addressed each of the comments below.

1. Small English Mistake at p9, line 215-216.

We have amended the sentence in question and it now reads:
“Three families in the first wave and one family in the second wave completed less than 10 hours of recording due to either device malfunction or choosing to stop the recording early and were excluded from further analysis.”

2. What does "162 mother's education excluded" mean? (see flow chart, Figure 1). Thank-you for considering the review, but it seems that the change done didn’t improve my understanding. My suggestion would be writing in the flow chart that 162 mothers were excluded based on their educational level or mother’s educational level out of the inclusion criteria and detailing these criteria in the text. There are large differences in the educational structures between countries and I believe the “certificate/diploma” may have different meanings cross-countries.

We have taken the editors suggestion and amended the flow chart to read:
“Mother’s Highest level of Completed Education out of Inclusion Criteria (n=162)”.

We have also included an extra sentence in the main text to hopefully aid interpretation for the readers across different contexts (see p6, para2, line 142-144):
“Mothers who had completed post school qualifications that was not a bachelor’s degree (e.g. certificate or diploma through vocational training) were excluded from the study.”
3. Inferential statistics required for between group comparisons.

We have undertaken independent sample t-tests for comparing the means between education groups at both waves of data collection. P-values are now reported in Table 2, along with a note regarding the analysis:
“*p-value is based on independent sample t-tests comparing the means between high and low educated groups”.

The only difference that arose between education groups (based on p-value of &lt; 0.05) was for child vocalisation count at 6 months of age. This is currently acknowledged in the results section (p10, para3, line 233 – 235):

“The only difference of note is at the first wave (6 months), with children in the low education group vocalizing slightly more than those in the high education group. This difference was not apparent in the second wave (12 months).”

No other group differences emerged for adult word count, conversational turns or child vocalisations in the second wave and therefore the results still support the current discussion and conclusions.