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Reviewer’s report:

General
The authors summarize the findings from a feasibility study of a pilot intervention to avoid excessive weight during pregnancy and the postpartum. The authors conclude that implementation of the intervention is feasible.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Introduction
1. There is no clearly stated hypothesis
2. It is unclear what the specific objectives are of the feasibility study. Is it to look at issues of recruitment and retention; compliance with intervention; implementation at specific sites or a combination of all three.

Methods
1. Since the authors use site-based randomization, it would be useful to have additional data/description of the different types of sites. For example, how does the difference in location affect care? Are the patient demographics different. Is the only variation the type of staff (e.g. PHNs) and the difference in counseling practices. If there is concern about the difference in current counseling practices, will it be possible to implement the intervention at certain sites?
2. I recognize that this is a pilot study, but there is no mention of power calculations or intention to treat.
3. The results section is written clearly.
   The tables are clear
   The figures do not have titles or legends.

Discussion
1. I would comment on how the results of this pilot study will affect plans for the formal, larger study
2. The discussion seems to only re-summarize the findings, rather than discuss the implications of the results and how the results can be used to further refine the intervention
3. There is no strengths and limitations paragraph in the discussion.
Minor: There are several areas in which the formatting of the text is inconsistent.

------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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