

Reviewer's report

Title: Pilot Evaluation of the text4baby mobile health program

Version: 5 **Date:** 24 September 2012

Reviewer: Lorraine Wallace

Reviewer's report:

General Comments

This manuscript addresses a timely and interesting research question. However, as currently presented, much of the methodology employed is difficult to assess.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Abstract

1. The abstract seems too long. Is it within the journal word limit?
2. The Background section should include a strong and focused purpose statement.
3. In the conclusion section, you note that this was a "pilot" study. This should be acknowledged in the purpose statement.

Introduction

4. The third and fourth paragraph would be better suited to include within the Methods section.
5. As noted in the comment above, the Figure 1 should be presented in the Methods section.
6. The purpose statement should acknowledge that this was a pilot study.

Methods

7. At nearly five pages, the Methods section is too long. Much of the information presented is duplicated; much important information is not discussed.
8. Where the women provided incentives to participate? What was the response rate? How many women were approached to participate? What was the drop-out rate? Do you have any information on drop-outs?
9. A large proportion of the women were Spanish-speaking. I am assuming that study personnel were fluent in Spanish and/or bilingual. Please elaborate on the training study personnel underwent.
10. Was the 24-item valid and reliable? Please provide these data. Was the survey administered in both Spanish and English?

11. Please provide specific examples of the behavioral outcome variables.

12. The target sample size for the study was 260 participants. The actual number of participants enrolled was much smaller than this (n=123). Please explain why you were unable to recruit less than half of the needed participants for this study.

13. Was the sample size adequate to allow for multivariate logistic analyses? Please confirm with a statistician.

Results

14. How many interviews were conducted in English and Spanish separately?

Discussion

15. Much of the information presented in the limitations section is not presented in the Methods or Results section. Many of these issues should be addressed prior to being acknowledged in the limitations section.

Table 1

16. It would be helpful to the reader to provide sociodemographic data as a function of language as well.

Table 2

17. I am assuming that the p-value presented represents the difference between the baseline and follow-up samples. Is this correct? If so, this information should be provided at the bottom of the table.

Table 3

18. Many of the confidence intervals are significant, but very wide. These findings are a result of the small sample size. This should be listed as an additional study limitation.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.