Peer Review File

Article information: https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/mhealth-23-43

Reviewer A

This is a very well written paper that builds on a foundational body of work. This reviewer would advise the authors to further develop the discussion section to help distinguish this manuscript as a substantial stand alone manuscript. This is not to say this information should not be published. It would be of benefit to the literature for the authors to provide extremely clear and clinically meaningful future directions related to development of an intervention or another survey to help target recruitment, specifically around the concerns of confidentiality and development of unhealthy habits. The reviewer acknowledges the current attempt in the manuscript on p12 line 345 to page 13 line 395. However, it is unclear to the reader how other clinicians will utilize this information in its current stand-alone manuscript form.

Reply: We thank the reviewer for their positive feedback on our manuscript. We added a Box summarizing clear and meaningful future directions both for researchers and clinicians who seek to leverage Instagram to deliver lifestyle interventions or create support communities for pregnant persons. We also expanded Discussion to better highlight these recommendations and implications for future research and clinical practice.
Changes in text: Expanded Discussion (page 15, lines 326-327, line 336, lines 339-340; page 16, line 372, lines 377-383; page 17, lines 397-399, line 402); added Box (page 29).

Reviewer B
Tables
   (1) Please supplement the table head in Tables 1-3.

	Very or quite a bit interested, n (%)
Age (per 5 years)	
Race/ethnicity	
···Non-Hispanic white	51 (30)
···Other race/ethnicity	27 (44)

Reply: We have added a header for this first column of Table 1: "Participant characteristics".
Changes to text: Table 1, page 24.

   (2) The below data is inconsistent with Table 1.

255   pregnancy (aOR=3.3, 95% CI: 1.4-7.8), and those who searched for pregnancy-related content on

256   Instagram multiple times weekly (aOR=3.7, 95% CI: 1.6-7.8; Table 1). In contrast, women with

(Reference)
1.7 (0.7-4.0)
3.7 (1.6-8.7)

Reply: We thank for catching the typo in our Results text. We have corrected the upper limit of the 95% CI to 8.7 to match Table 1.
Changes to text: Results, page 11, line 246.

(3) Please define "HS" "GES" "OR" "CI" in Table 1.

Reply: We replaced "HS/GED, 1-3 years college, Associate's" with "Less than Bachelor's degree" in Table 1 to improve clarity while being concise. We added a footnote to Table 1 defining OR as "odds ratio" and 95% CI as "95% confidence interval".
Changes to text: Table 1, page 24, and page 25, line 776.

(4) It is suggested revising Box 1 as Table 4 or Supplementary Table 1 with table heads (separate to three columns).

Reply: We have revised Box 1 to Table 4, with 3 separate columns. We edited the column header of the third column to match the other columns: "Researchers developing and testing Instagram-delivered lifestyle interventions for pregnant persons". We have also updated references to the Box in the manuscript text to refer to Table 4.
Changes to text: Table 4, page 29; Discussion, page 17, lines 378, 385, 389, and 392.