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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions: page 24 top of page:
There needs to be justification given for your assumptions about what has found its way into 'routine practice'. What is currently written is to sketchy and fails to differentiate national guidelines and evidence that guidelines are applied well in practice. Knowledge transfer requires evidence that practice change has occurred through audit etc.

It is not clear what your generalisations about what has been implemented (your example is folic acid supplementation) and what has not is based on. How would you measure this etc. You need a paragraph at least exploring this.

There is some inconsistency between a statement on page 25 about Sure start and family nurse partnership that you say has not been evaluation in the long term, though it is being rolled out and on page 26, middle paragraph about effective interventions for vulnerable women not being implemented. Isn't sure start and family nurse partnership aimed at these groups?

Finally bottom of p27 and top of page 28 seems to say 'don't take much notice of this review - you need to go to the original to get a true understanding??

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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