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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Methods-Participants (1st paragraph). More information should be provided about the RCT of which this is a substudy. If published studies are available about that RCT, they should be referenced. In particular, the intervention in that RCT should be identified. Table 2 provides data for control and intervention groups but the paper does not describe the intervention and the reader cannot readily determine what that intervention was.

2. Methods-PPAQ (3rd paragraph). The definitions of the Non-Exercisers and Exercisers are inconsistent with those presented in other sections and appear to be reversed. This would be very confusing for a causal reader.

3. Results-Energy Expenditure (1st paragraph). The manuscript asserts that the proportion of Non-exercisers remained relatively stable at time points after twenty weeks. However, Table 1 shows that the proportion of Non-exercisers increases at 36 weeks: it increases by nearly 50%, from 40% at 20 weeks to 57% at 36 weeks. An increase of that magnitude is not consistent with the statement that the proportion was relatively stable.

Minor essential revisions
1. Background (1st paragraph). I am unaware of any exercise "requirements" for pregnant women. Perhaps a better word would be "recommendations." (Or perhaps the requirements relate to the Intervention which is not described)

2. Methods-Participants (1st paragraph). Probably "outpatient" should be singular as in other parts of the paper ("recruited from the hospital's outpatient clinic").

3. Discussion (5th paragraph). Last sentence: it is not possible to determine causality in this study (tyo: "this" not "is").

4. Study limitations are not clearly addressed.

Discretionary Revisions
1. The writing style would be greatly improved if all sentences beginning with "there is" started with the subject of the sentence. Sentences would be stronger and easier to read, and the meaning would be clearer.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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