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Author's response to reviews: see over
Reply to the Reviewers/Editors

Firstly, we thank the Reviewers and the Editors for their helpful comments. The following letter provides a point-by-point reply to the additional comments.

Reviewer’s report 1:

“The authors have in general made a good job of addressing the reviewers comments and the manuscript is much improved as a result. I suggest a few minor revisions prior to publication.”

Minor Essential Revisions

1. “p.4 The paper states that the “...trial...to reduce GWG by consulting on:...” I Don’t think this is the correct word. Do you mean counselling?”

Thank you, we mean “counseling”. We changed the paragraph according to your suggestion.

2. “p4 towards the bottom of the page. “Eight gynecological practices agreed participating” should be agreed to participate..”

We changed this paragraph according to your suggestion.

3. “p.5 The paper states that the structure of the counselling sessions ensured standardization. While the standardisation may have gone some way to reduce variations, without some analysis of the session contents this is not certain. Assuming that this did not happen the possibility of differences between counsellors remains and should be noted as a potential limitation.”

We added the possibility of differences between counselors as a potential limitation of the trial to our discussion section. Nevertheless, the counseling was structured.

4. “p.7 The authors provide a reference for the 5kg weight retention criterion in the reply to reviewers but this is currently missing from the paper itself.”

Thank you for this comment. We added the missing references to the paper.

5. “p.13 The discussed on the changes in physical activity during the pregnancy and between conditions is a little confused. It is not clear what differences are due to the large baseline differences and which are due to real changes and I therefore think that this paragraph should be reworded in order to explain this more clearly.”
We reworded the paragraph in order to clarify the changes in physical activity during pregnancy and between groups.

Reviewer’s report 2:

“I am satisfied with the response provided by the authors and the modifications that they have made taking into account the peer reviewers comments.”

Thank you very much!

The authors