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Dear Editorial Team

Re: resubmission of the following research paper to BMC Pregnancy & Childbirth:

Eating for 1, Healthy and Active for 2; feasibility of delivering novel, compact training for midwives to build knowledge and confidence in giving nutrition, physical activity and weight management advice during pregnancy.

(MS: 1085200182111018)

The authors wish to thank the reviewers and the editorial team for their constructive feedback and review of the manuscript. All comments been given careful consideration and the information provided in the table below describes where and how amendments have been made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer No.</th>
<th>Reviewers Comments</th>
<th>Authors Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Although this is an audit, it is still not clear how and when consent was obtained prior to data collecting. The process for information giving about the audit and gaining informed consent has not been described in detail under the data collection section.</td>
<td>Amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The results section is clearly set out however there is still an assumption that those who attended completed the questionnaires when they should have been given a choice.</td>
<td>Amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Page 3: Second paragraph – Should read National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence followed by (NICE).</td>
<td>Amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Page 4: First paragraph – Should MI be ‘Motivational Interviewing’ rather then ‘Motivation Interviewing’?</td>
<td>Amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Data Collection Top of page 7 should include ‘Likert’ - ‘4-point and 5-point Likert scale [37] …’</td>
<td>Amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Firstly as indicated in my previous review, I am not best placed to assess the statistical methods used in this paper, and would recommend that this is</td>
<td>As suggested, we have taken advice from a statistical reviewer and have implemented all their suggestions. We have replaced the Kruskal-Wallis with a Friedman’s analysis of variance and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19th May 2014
reviewed by a statistician prior to publication. I note that although Kruskal-Wallis is included within the data analysis section, minimal information is provided regarding its use is included.

undertaken subsequent pair-wise comparisons question-by-question. The reviewer suggested grouping all the reports of ‘better’ knowledge and confidence together and comparing to ‘stayed the same’, so we have also reported ‘much better’ alongside. None of the changes have affected any of the statistical significances and therefore not altered any of our conclusions. We are confident that our findings are as originally reported. We do not go into great detail of the tests within the results section, since the statistics are there to confirm the observations and they are presented in the tables.

3

Secondly I note that as I had suggested in my earlier review, the authors have now included an ethics section within the paper, I understand that as ‘service evaluation’ this study does not need to be reviewed by LREC. Though, ethical considerations still exist and I feel it is a shame that ethical principles have not been discussed under this section (although they remain within the data analysis section). However, I do not wish to delay publication of this paper on this basis.

The research team considered the possible ethical implications in undertaking the audit of the training model and we felt there were no obvious ethical concerns. We do acknowledge however that there are many ethical considerations in health professionals who work on this very sensitive subject with women who are pregnant and therefore themselves possibly feeling hyper-sensitive about their weight, feel a strong sense of responsibility towards their unborn child and so on. This would certainly be suitable for another paper, or if the editorial team wishes us to include a sentence we would be happy to include something in the discussions on the wider ethical implications of this type of intervention.

We look forward to hearing the outcome of the resubmission in due course,

Yours Sincerely

Andrea Basu MSc BSc (Hons) RD RNutr (Public Health).