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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

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 terms – why did you not include antenatal/prenatal/gestation; intervention; randomised controlled trial?

When antenatal used the following review comes up that has not been cited. How does your review extend the findings of the one below?

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.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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