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Reviewer's report:

"REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? No

Reviewer comments: The authors have made considerable improvements to this work but some additional small changes need to be made.

First, several of the newly added changes are in incorrect English and need to be rewritten.

The authors have added context but their use of the phrase ""The Youth Health Centre"" in the Background section needs explanation. I realize they describe this in more depth later but it is out of context here. Also, is this a good translation? Does the YHC some kind of government agency? Later, you say there are 10 YHC organizations. I don't suppose this is your problem but I wonder on what authority the YHC makes feeding recommendations that differ from those made by the WHO...

I do not believe that the response ""never given"" [as it relates to when infant stopped breastfeeding] can be equated with breastfeeding over 6 months. It sounds more like missing data to me -especially given that later in the paper the categories appear to include ""still breastfeeding"" which is not the same as not giving an answer, but seems to have been grouped together with that answer for this study. Were there 2 separate categories - parents who never responded, and parents who said they were still breastfeeding?

The paper remains confusing (partly due to the English) particularly around definitions of duration etc. The definitions, results, and tables are not consistent or categorized in the way the authors state. For example, the categories of breastfeeding duration described in the narrative are not the same as those presented in the Table. Please clarify this for consistency and comprehensibility. At the moment the reader is completely lost between all the different durations described.

The fact that there are no data on exclusive breastfeeding is a limitation. Exclusive breastfeeding, the WHO recommendation, is not only about additions of solids. The data in the rest of the paper are still valid however, so you might want to remove some of the detail about breastfeeding and reduce the number of categories you list. Please also clarify ""duration of any breastfeeding"" (not just, 'duration
of breastfeeding'."

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or
has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

This reviewer has been recruited by a partner organization, Research Square. Reviewers with declared or apparent competing interests are not utilized for these reviews. This reviewer has agreed to publication of their comments online under a Creative Commons Attribution License attributed to Research Square and was paid a small honorarium for completing the review within a specified timeframe. Honoraria for reviews such as this are paid regardless of the reviewer recommendation.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal