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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: This is an interesting study that could contribute to the research in this field with some revisions.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
First, it's important to place the study, the context is not given until the Discussion section; up to that point one doesn't know in which continent or nation this is located. Similarly we need context for BeeBOFT study, as this may not be known to the reader. Similarly, the concept of a "youth health care team" needs to be explained (in general, the paper is lacking adequate context). Also, the Background should include something more specific in terms of a research frame of reference for the Netherlands, or at least, that region of Europe. Many of the references cited for previous studies, for example, are from US based or other work - why would one assume this is the same in the Netherlands?

It is a little confusing also regarding who did what. Is this a secondary data analysis? It seems that way, but it's not quite spelled out. If the Ethics review board determined it's not human subjects research, then it must be a secondary data analysis, otherwise it seems like human subjects research - could the authors clarify that? It also states who funded the BeeBOFT study, but that those funds did not support this research(?). If so, who did, or was there no dedicated funding for this study?

The authors state that the last 'response category' (P5) was 'over 5 months' but 1 of the outcome categories is 'over 6 months', could you clarify this discrepancy? It's important due to the WHO guideline.

The breastfeeding question was not a standardized or recommended question; ideally we want to know initiation (any breastfeeding) and duration of exclusive breastfeeding - just asking about breastfeeding is likely to weaken any associations as 'breastfeeding' without a clear definition is too broad to be of great use as a determinant. Can you tell us anything about standardization for the other questions?

Overall however, despite these small points needing clarification, this is a really well designed and clearly described study which will add useful information to the field.
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Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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