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**Reviewer's report:**

**General comments**

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this paper. The literature around this area clearly identifies a need for appropriate training and education of midwives in order to improve their confidence in discussing weight management with pregnant women (Olander, Atkinson et al. 2011; Heselhurst, Russell et al. 2012). Therefore the topic being explored in this paper is of relevance to midwives, managers and midwifery educators as well as other professions with an interest in health promotion in pregnancy.

In saying that, I feel that there are some minor amendments that are required before publication which will improve the quality of the paper.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

1) **Title**

The title chosen does not accurately reflect the paper – this was an evaluation of novel training and not just a feasibility study. Therefore I would advise that the title is amended to reflect this.

2) **Background**

The background provides adequate information relating the health of pregnant women in the UK and Wales, demonstrating obesity rates and implications for health.

2.1) The reference for the NICE guidance (at the start of the 2nd paragraph) in this section is missing and needs adding.

2.2) The paper by Furness et al (2012) looked at overweight and obese women not all women and so this should be inserted into the text. (….identified a lack of confidence amongst overweight and obese pregnant women regarding….).

2.3) There also appears to be an unnecessary ‘and’ after ‘intervene’ in the last sentence of the second paragraph. There are also some statements which may need some toning down such as:
2.3a) “this suggest midwives are not routinely discussing nutrition or healthy weight management” – I am not sure the preceding sentence does suggest this, but agree that it may impact on their ability to do so effectively.

2.3b) Also “should therefore seek to embed the foundations of MI” – this is rather strong. MI may provide some assistance but it is by no means necessary. Perhaps simply changing this to ‘could therefore seek’ may be more appropriate?

2.4) A reference should be included to the sentence about the economic burden -Perhaps include the foresight report? (Butland, Jebb et al. 2007)

2.5) The training included teaching midwives about recommended weight gain using IOM guidance (IOM 2009) despite NICE advising against routine repeated weighing (NICE 2008; NICE 2010). This is a contentious area and perhaps the background should include a discussion about the debate about its use in the UK (although this is mentioned within the discussion section).

3) Methods

3.1) Further explanation is needed regarding the use of an integrative review to inform the design of the compact training model. There are bullet-points which I believe relate to this but this is not made explicit – this could be addressed by simply including an appropriate heading.

3.2) There appears to be little description of the ethical implications of this research – Although under the data collection section it refers to anonymity and consent and unusually under the data analysis section it does make comment about not requiring ethical review. These two statements should be within the same section - perhaps included under a separate heading of ‘Ethics’ or ‘Ethical implications’? Despite this being classified as service evaluation as opposed to research, ethical principles should still be considered and discussed. To assist the authors, further information about this can be found via the Health Quality improvement Partnership Toolkit (available at http://www.hqip.org.uk/assets/Downloads/Audit-Research-Service-Evaluation.pdf). Also if the R&D department within the LHB were notified of this evaluation, this should be specified.

3.3) The questionnaires used did not measure midwives’ knowledge, rather they measured midwives reported knowledge and reported improvement in knowledge. This should be made clear throughout the paper (including within the abstract) – at present it appears only to be referred to within the discussion. Ideally if you are looking at before and after measurements, you would use the same questionnaire so that accurate changes between the two time points can be assessed.

3.4) I am not best placed to comment on the statistical methods used and would advise statistical review. However, there is reference in both tables 2 and 3 that statistical significance was measured using Kruskal-Wallis. This analysis is not included in the body of the paper and should certainly be included under the data
analysis section of the paper.

3.5) The section under Post training knowledge – describes improvement for recommended weight gain – yet there are currently no clinical guidelines regarding this – participants were advised to use IOM guidance which is not advocated for use in the UK. Therefore it is unsurprising that there was improvement in knowledge as this was new guidance – perhaps a brief sentence could be included to clarify this?

4.) Limitations should include that the post training questionnaire designed to evaluate the training provided was administered by the trainer. Therefore despite the fact that the questionnaire was anonymous, social desirability may have influenced the results.

5.) Reference list – I am aware that the paper by Jenny Welstand et al. (Welstand, Carson et al. 2009) has the wrong title and date – I have not explored all the references but these will need to be checked for accuracy prior to publication.

6.) Also authors contributions ought to include information relating to the writing of the paper not just the research conducted – i.e. were all authors involved in the writing and approval of the final manuscript?

Major compulsory Revisions - None.
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