For research article

Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking thetime to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the revisions highlighted in the re-submitted files.

2. Questionsfor General Evaluation	**Reviewer's Evaluation**	**Response and Revisions**
Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?	Must be improved	
Is the research design appropriate?	Can be improved	
Are the methods adequately described?	Yes	
Are the results clearly presented?	Must be improved	
Are the conclusions supported by the results?	Can be improved	
Are all figures and tables clear and well-presented?	Must be improved	

3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comments 1: *The introduction would have included a few sentences about the components of human milk, why it is so important, what properties it has, and which components, besides mRNA, may influence childhood obesity.*

Response 1: Thank you for pointing this out. We indeed added a new subunit including this information. It is located in page 1, see 1.1 Human breast milk benefits in Introduction.

Comments 2: *The work often lacks citations; please carefully review, for example, the two paragraphs in subsection 1.2.*

Response 2: We agree with you. We have revised and added where it was necessary the citations that was used.

Comments 3: *In my opinion, Table 2 needs to be revised; it's difficult to read when it's split across two pages. Is the title of the work necessary? We have the author and the year of publication; in my opinion, the title is unnecessary and takes up a lot of space in the table. Perhaps combining "gestational age" and "gender" would be a good idea? The table needs to be reworded.*

Response 3: Agree**.** Table 2 was indeed difficult to read. For this reason, it is now revised. You can see the revised table 2 in pages 10-11. The title was removed and the reference was added, so the reader can find the article in the references subsection. Population and sample

analyzed was combined into sample characteristics. Health status and health issues of mothers were also combined into a single category named health status that has information about the BMI and other health issues if existed. In infant characteristics the breastfeeding status remained the same and another column inserted that included the gestational age and gender. All data that remained on the table are essential in order to understand the basic differences, between the analyzed studies that are supplementary with the text in more detail and cannot be removed. We understand that it still can be difficult to read, however information like BMI or health issues that each study has taken into account are important and should be included. Also, breastfeeding status is important to be pointed out, as measurements in each study are different and may have an impact to the final results and conclusions. If you still believe that the table is difficult to read, we could probably include it in the supplementary data. However, in my opinion it should be mentioned in the main text to follow the flow of the reading.

Comments 4: *Table 3 - needs to be standardized; the beginning of the table is centered, and the rest of the text is on the left side.*

Response 4: You are right; table 3 was accidentally aligned to the center. You can find the revised table 3 in page 12.

Comments 5: *For a review, the number of articles used is very small (only 33). I understand the authors' intention regarding the inclusion and exclusion criteria and the scarcity of research on this topic. However, 33 cited articles, including the introduction, seems quite small.*

Response 5: The research topic that was chosen in this case is quite new and though the bibliography is not that extended. For this reason, I believe that the literature that we used was reliable enough and we didn't want to add unrelated literature just to have more citations. However, based on the comments of reviewer 2, some new subunits mostly in introduction were added and the total number of citations was eventually increased to 64.