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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to reviewers of RIAE-D-19-00041R1 (Parenting Science Gang)
Thanks to Reviewer 1 for your enthusiasm for our project, we really appreciate it.

Reviewer 2 – thank you for your constructive comments. Below we detail the extensive changes that we have made as a result of these comments (Line numbers refer to comments made on the original submission).

Abstract and Plain English Summary – we have added some additional information about the impact on the participants, but also kept in details of the academic outputs as we feel these are very important.

L95 – We have added additional keywords, thank you.

L108 on - Parents/mothers – although we were keen to encourage parents of any gender within the project, the vast majority of our PSG members were women, hence the use of the word mothers in some instances. However, in order not to exclude members who do not identify as mothers, we also use the word parents in this paper. When we mention ‘mothers’ rather than ‘parents’ in the introduction, this is because the papers we discuss were specifically focused on mothers.

L147 unclear – thank you we have rephrased this long sentence.

L174 – a) we have added some more details about the spectrum, and drew more on the citizen science literature b) we have also justified why it is radical – because it was more than just co-creation as it was entirely led by parents. Through the reworking process we have decided to change the title to drop the word co-design, as it was more than just design that parents were leading on (point c), and d) We have
added discussion of how well we feel we achieved this within the discussion section, within the Methods of engagement sub-section and Caveats and limitations sub-section. We have stated the aim and modified the paper structure and changed some emphasis to reflect this.

L212 – We have amended the text about mother/daughter groups to clarify this and changed the structure of this section. We have more fully reflected on our participants and their relative lack of diversity in the discussion section.

L248 we didn’t have a scientific co-ordinator, but this comment made us realise we weren’t explicit enough about who we are, so we have added additional details under the Staff of PSG section.

L262 – We have added some more details and a reference in.

L287 – We have described more about our survey respondents. We were unable to check whether the distribution of characteristics between survey respondents and participants is the same, because the survey was the only way we had of gaining any demographic data.

L225 – Thank you for suggesting the combining of tables – we have done so, and standardised the way we describe the study. We have reflected on the co-design process in the discussion section.
L418 Abbreviations clarified throughout.

Discussion – we have moved content into the results section and expanded the discussion, particularly around co-creation.

Author’s contributions – we have added text explaining the role of various people involved in the project under the Staff in PSG section.

Reviewer 3: Thank you very much for your kind words about the project, we are glad you liked hearing about it. We have amended the line (previously L110/111) about mobilisation to make it clearer that we were talking about increased mobility of people, and also mentioned the cuts in services. We have removed reference to digital literacy (previously L158) as we don’t have any further discussion of this topic.