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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have addressed most of the issues raised by the reviewers and the manuscript is much improved. However, I have a few comments that still need to be addressed.

Abstract

Change ‘logistical’ to ‘logistic’

Table 2 – column headings for groups should indicate the size of the group.

Why is the value in the “Mean” column not always the average of (i.e., falling in between) the ‘control’ and ‘text4baby’ columns?

I still disagree with statement about verifying that the data is MCAR. A critical part of the MCAR assumption is that missingness was not related to change in the outcome (or post test). This is not testable and why MCAR is not verifiable.

More information is needed about the GEE models’ output presented in table 3. I don’t understand the difference between the bottom two rows (‘overall agreement’ and ‘improvement in agreement’). Are these rows presenting the odds ratio comparing the treatment to the control group within the ‘HS>education’ level of education (the effect modifier)? Is table 3 presenting coefficients from 8 models or from 24 models? Perhaps the linear model needs to be written out in a table note so it is clear what is being presented in the tables.

Table 2 and 3 - What is the difference between the items “taking a prenatal vitamin is important to the health of my developing baby” AND “Taking prenatal vitamins will improve the health of my developing baby?” Shouldn’t these items be combined into a scale?
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