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Reviewer's report:

Overall
The authors are to be commended for addressing an important and understudied topic.

The use of the term ‘predominantly Puerto Rican population’ is a bit misleading. Since the population was Caribbean Latino, I think that would be a better term for your study population.

Specific

1. Abstract, results: The perceived stress variable is a bit ‘out of the blue,’ without proper context. If you plan to include the variable in the analyses, it needs to be explained and explored in greater detail. It could be related to acculturation but you do not fully explore that relationship.


3. Abstract, conclusion: The acculturation variables were not consistently associated with gestational weight gain but the conclusion does not mention this variability.

4. Abstract, conclusion: The conceptual ‘leap’ to highlight the role of the ‘environment’ is too far for me. Could you please explain what you mean in greater detail?

5. Introduction, page 3, para 1: The issue of Latino subgroups should be discussed in the introduction.

6. Introduction, page 3, para 2: please cite the reference for your definition of acculturation.

7. Introduction, page 4, para 2: The ‘disparities’ are not all negative for Latinos but you do not fully describe what you mean. Please add more detail.

8. Introduction, page 4, para 3: Did you hypothesize that all measures of acculturation would be significantly associated with gestational weight gain? If so, that hypothesis should be explicitly stated.

9. Methods, page 5, para 2: was the ‘history of diagnosis of diabetes, etc’ a
pre-pregnancy condition?

10. Methods, page 5, para 2: Please explain the rationale for the age cutoffs that you used.

11. Methods, page 6, para 2: I thought that you obtained information about pre-pregnancy weight during the interview but you also stated that you obtained it from the medical record. Please clarify.

12. Methods, page 7, para 2: The reason that you chose to include the perceived stress item should be explained. What did you hypothesize would be added by this variable as compared with the other acculturation measures?

13. Results, page 8, para 3: The proportion of smokers seemed high to me; what was your assessment?

14. Results, page 8-9: I found it unusual that age, education, parity, BMI, smoking, and physical activity did not vary according to the PAS measure. What was your assessment?

15. Results, page 9, para 2: The section that describes the relationship between the acculturation measures and gestational weight gain is a listing and hard to follow.

16. Discussion, page 11, para 2: The variation in the relationship between the acculturation measure and gestational weight gain needs to be explained.

17. Discussion, page 11, para 3: “Heilmen” – the name of this author is misspelled.

18. Discussion, page 12: I believe that the consistency between your results and previous studies should be further explored. What are the implications of this similarity?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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