

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tp-23-185>

Response to the reviewers

Comments from Reviewers	Response to Reviewers
Reviewer A	
1. There are several minor issues that if addressed would significantly improve the manuscript.	Revised as suggested
2. The research scope is limited to a hospital in Wenzhou City, which is very limited. Suggest increasing comparative analysis with other regional hospitals, as the results may be more meaningful.	Revised as suggested (see Page 6 & 7, line 161-166; page 14-15, line 432-438)
3. The abstract is not sufficient and needs further modification.	Revised as suggested (see Page 2, abstract)
4. The research background did not indicate the clinical needs of the research focus.	Revised as suggested (see Page2, line 5-12)
5. What are the other aspects of the impact of family environment and parenting style on infant obesity? In addition to the government policy support in this study, what other ways may be possible to change this situation? It is recommended to add relevant content.	Revised as suggested (see Page 4, line 89-92, Page 6, Line 143-148; page 13, line 377-381)
6. Please describe the relationship between breastfeeding, microbiota, and the risk of overweight during infancy, and further analyze the types and timing of supplementary feeding.	Revised as suggested (see Page 4, Line 83-89, Line 93-97)
7. This study did not classify and compare primipara and multiparous mothers separately. It is recommended to conduct separate studies as their parenting experiences are different.	Revised as suggested (see Page 4, Page 99-102, Table 2; page 15, line 453-455)
8. The introduction part of this paper is not comprehensive enough, and the similar papers have not been cited, such as “Association between the use of antibiotics during pregnancy and obesity in 5-year-old children, Transl Pediatr, PMID: 34295783”. It is recommended to quote the articles.	Revised as suggested (see Page 4, line 95-98)
8. How can parenting self-efficacy predict their baby's growth trajectory? It is recommended to add relevant content.	Revised as suggested (see Page 5, line 129-133; page 6, line 134)
Thank you very much for your suggestions. We appreciate it.	
Reviewer B	
1. First of all, in the whole paper, terms such as “predict feeding behaviors” and “predictors” are misleading because this is only a	Revised as suggested (see title)

Comments from Reviewers	Response to Reviewers
cross-sectional study, which can only answer the clinical question of “associated factors” not “predictors”. The authors need to indicate the clinical research design in the title.	
<p>2. Second, the abstract needs some revisions. The background did not indicate the clinical significance of this research focus and what has been unknown on factors associated with mothers’ feeding behaviors.</p> <p>The methods did not describe the inclusion of subjects, how the questionnaire was administered, and the factor or outcomes measured by the scales.</p> <p>In the results, the authors need to briefly describe the clinical characteristics of the study sample, the regression coefficients of the identified factors, and importantly, please have an overall assessment on the feeding behaviors of mothers. The conclusion needs to be made strictly based on the findings of this study.</p>	Revised as suggested (see abstract)
<p>3. Third, in the introduction of the main text, the authors need to have a detailed review on what has been known in the levels of feeding behaviors of mothers of obese infants and their associated factors, have comments on the knowledge gaps and limitations of prior studies, and clearly describe the clinical significance of the proposed analysis.</p>	Revised as suggested (see Page 5, Line 117-129; Page 6, Line 138-142, 149-154; Page 11, Line 325-328)
<p>4. Fourth, in the methodology of the main text, please reconsider the sample size estimation procedures, since there are many potential factors and the sample size of 134 did not allow for the proposed analysis.</p> <p>Please indicate whether there is a cut-off value for classifying good and bad feeding behaviors in the PFBQ. If not, please describe how to assess the level of feeding behaviors in the study sample.</p> <p>In statistics, please describe the details of multiple linear regression, test the normality of variables, and ensure $P < 0.05$ is two-sided.</p>	<p>Revised as suggested (see Page7, line 174-176)</p> <p>Thank you very much for your concern.</p> <p>There is not a cut-off value for classifying good and bad feeding behaviors in the PFBQ. It is interpreted that the higher score indicates the more appropriate feeding behaviors. (Page 8, Line 223-224)</p> <p>Revised as suggested (see Page10, line 266-267)</p>
Thank you very much for your suggestions. We appreciate it.	
Reviewer C	
This is an important study and authors have identified an important gap in the literature in measuring influencing factors on feeding behaviors among caregivers of infants who meet criteria	Thank you very much for your commendation.

Comments from Reviewers	Response to Reviewers
for obesity in China. This is a unique study in that it seeks to understand possible change mechanisms for influencing a positive feeding environment and how to deliver anticipatory guidance to mothers in China.	
1. Methods section, data analysis paragraph: Please report on how and rate of missing data.	<p>Revised as suggested (see Page 9, line 259-261)</p> <p>This study had 4.3% attrition rate, but no missing data.</p>
2. I would encourage authors to report their income measure findings differently in the result section.	Revised as suggested (see Page10, line279-282)
In the methods section, authors noted they collected family level demographics of income. Please provide a rationale for only reporting on maternal personal income and not family/household total income. Or report total household income and divide it by the number of adults and children in the household for each participant. This is usually a better measure and how it is typically reported in other journals.	<p>Revised as suggested (see Page 7, Line 181-183; page12, line 356-358, line 362-364)</p> <p>Thank you very much for your concern. Next study should pay attention to family income.</p> <p>This study presents mother' s income and main source of household income since the majority of family income comes from joint income and the father of the infants. The mother's income did not represent the family income or affect the access to and quality of food for her children.</p>
I see the note in the limitation section, but this doesn't provide quite the rationale I was looking for - was total family income not collected? If not, state that clearly in the limitations section. If it was collected, I would re-do analyses.	Revised as suggested (see Page14. line 428-432)
<p>Minor comments:</p> <p>Line 71-72, This sentence is confusing. Authors note that childhood obesity is a result of genetic and environmental factors, which is true, but then list 2 factors that are actually associated with healthy weight trajectories, not obesity. Per research, formula feeding and early introduction to complimentary foods (prior to 6 months) is associated with obesity. It's confusing for authors to say "exclusive breastfeeding, food supplementation after 6 months", because this gives the impression that these healthy feeding behaviors are associated with obesity.</p>	Revised as suggested (see Page 4, line 80-83)
Discussion: An alternative conclusion may be that a mobile public health intervention (mHealth application) that is easy to access and offers evidence-based information about responsive feeding/parenting behaviors and creating a healthy food environment may benefit these mothers and infants in these	<p>Revised as suggested (see Page 15, line 450-453)</p> <p>Thank you very much for your suggestions. We appreciate it.</p>

Comments from Reviewers	Response to Reviewers
communities, especially because they are already seeking this information from their mobile phones, not the medical setting.	
Reviewer D	
Please check if Ref.2 and Ref.11 are the same references since they share the same author list and article title.	We have finished checking the references.
References should be cited consecutively in text, please cite Ref.44 consecutively after Ref.43, and please also check and revise the other citations in text	We have finished correcting Citation and reference numbers.
And Ref.38-43 were not cited in text, please cite them in order in your paper.	We have finished correcting Citation and reference numbers.
Please update the references in the main text, you only have 52 references included in the references list while 75 cited in text.	We have finished correcting Citation and reference numbers.
And please make sure the name of first author matches to its reference cited.	We have finished checking the reference.
And please also check if any reference should be cited in this sentence since you've mentioned "A previous study". 919 electronic media. Previous studies have shown that familiar eating places and feeding 920 utensils can reduce resistance to feeding and increase the chances of successful 921 feeding. Fixed cutlery can help the caregiver understand the exact amount of food the	We revised.
The reference should match to the information mentioned. 736 The Social Support Rating Scale (SSRS) was used to measure social support (54). It	We have finished checking the reference.