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Dear Editor,

RE – Preventing weight gain: the baseline weight related behaviors and delivery of a randomized controlled intervention in community based women.

Thank-you for providing the reviewers comments on this manuscript.

Please find below my response to each of the reviewer’s comments.

Reviewer 1: Toni Yancey

1. The title and abstract has been changed to reflect the reviewers concerns about baseline vs process data. Information on attendance and the value of the intervention components has been added to the results and discussion in an attempt to add further to the assessment of the delivery methods. Therefore, I believe that the word delivery should still be included in the title.
2. I agree that this paragraph did not clearly communicate the intended message and therefore I have added text to address this.
3. I have added text regarding why school size was used in randomization.
4. Eligible numbers have been added to both text and figure 1.
5. Text was added to define ‘ongoing support’ –ie. mobile phone text messages.
6. Thank you for this suggestion. An additional table has been added (table 3) describing diet, activity and weight practices according to BMI.
7. I have discussed the utility of the school setting in the discussion (paragraph 2). However, sustainability is more difficult as there are no similar studies. I have changed text to reflect the success in recruiting and delivery which is within the scope of the paper.

Reviewer 2: G Eiben

1. Text has been added to the discussion regarding the level of participation.
2. The reference used for this data is a longitudinal study in women which followed the same three age cohorts over the past 10 years. I believe it represents women who will now be aged in their 30’s. The figure 0.6 represents a mean weight gain between the younger cohort and the mid age cohort. I have included an extra reference that represents more accurately women with children.
3. I agree that including the recent reference to Lemmens 2008 is important and I have done so.
4. I have addressed the reviewers minor changes including:
   1. corrected
   2. corrected
   3. information added
   4. corrected
   5. corrected
   6. corrected
   7. table 1 income corrected
8. p values provided in table 2 as requested

Reviewer 3: Alison Booth

1. I have added text in the methods section referring to the stage of change. I have not provided a complete definition, but a reference is given which provides further information.
2. The stage of change has been clarified to reflect level of motivation.
3. I have added n values where appropriate in the results section.
4. I expect that the reviewer is concerned about the apparently lower than expected energy intake levels. Self-reported diet is consistently under estimated. Therefore a comment has been added to the discussion regarding accuracy of the food frequency questionnaire and the energy and fat intake of participants.