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Author's response to reviews:

Title: Lifestyle interventions for overweight and obese pregnant women to improve pregnancy outcome: systematic review and meta-analysis
Version: 1 Date: 19 January 2012
Reviewer: Jodie Dodd: THANK YOU

Reviewer's report:
Obesity in pregnancy is an increasingly common clinical problem, and one associated with well documented risks. The review includes both randomised and non-randomised studies, without language restrictions, and has utilised robust and well described systematic review methodology. The findings of the review are consistent with others published on the topic, and highlights the lack of high quality evidence on which to base clinical practice recommendations for interventions. THANK YOU

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.

2. Reviewer's report

Title: Lifestyle interventions for overweight and obese pregnant women to improve pregnancy outcome: systematic review and meta-analysis
Version: 1 Date: 31 January 2012
Reviewer: Helen Skouteris
Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions; oUR SEARCH INITIALLY WENT UPTO aPRIL 2011 AND HENCE THESE ARTICLE COULD NOT BE CITED AND STUDY EXCLUDES SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS. bUT HAVE NOW EXTENDED THE SEARCH TO jANUARY 2012

The aim of this study was to determine the efficacy of antenatal dietary, activity, behaviour or lifestyle interventions in overweight and obese pregnant women to improve maternal and perinatal outcomes. Overall, the paper is well written and the analyses and interpretation of findings good. However, I am concerned about the search terms and strategy; I am not confident your search has indeed been systematic. SEARCH TERM HAVE BEEN REPEATED BASED ON SUGGESTIONS MADE BY REFEREE. WE HAVE CREATED A SEARCH STRATEGY TABLE TO SHOW THAT IT HAS BEEN SYSTEMATIC

Re search terms – why did you not include antenatal/prenatal/gestation; intervention; randomised controlled trial? WE HAVE NOW INCLUDED ANTENATAL/PRENATAL/GESTATION/INTERVENTION/RANDOMISED CONTROLLED TRIAL. THANK YOU

When antenatal used the following review comes up that has not been cited. How does your review extend the findings of the one below?MORE COMPREHENSIVE AND FOCUSED CLINICAL OUTCOMES AND RESTRICTED WEIGHT GAIN ALONE

Antenatal exercise to improve outcomes in overweight or obese women: a systematic review
ZHIXIAN SUI, ROSALIE M GRIVELL and JODIE M DODD
Accepted manuscript online: 10 JAN 2012 02:55AM EST | DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0412.2012.01357

There is also this review that you have not cited and that contains studies with obese pregnant women that your review is lacking:
Systematic Review of Clinical Trials on Dietary Interventions to Prevent Excessive Weight Gain During Pregnancy Among Normal Weight, Overweight and Obese Women
Ida Tanentsapf; Berit L Heitmann; Amanda RA Adegboye
BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2011;11(81)
The authors need to revise their paper accordingly to ensure that these recent reviews are included but also that the search has been exhaustive in terms of studies included. RECENT REVIEWS CITED. BUT SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS WERE NOT PART OF THE SEARCH STRATEGY
Quality of written English: Acceptable: THANK YOU
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report: tHANK YOU