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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear editor,

Please find enclosed the revised version of our Manuscript ID: 1502106509134163 titled “Study ProtocolDifferential effects of diet and physical activity based interventions in pregnancy on maternal and fetal outcomes: Individual patient data (IPD) meta-analysis and health economic evaluation”; by Ruifrok et al.

We would like to thank the editor for allowing us to revise the paper and thank the reviewers for the comments and suggestions for our paper. We have read the comments with interest, and we have aimed to adjust the manuscript accordingly.

We hope that the revision along with this letter satisfactorily addresses the editor’s and reviewer’s comments, and we are looking forward to your final decision on the manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

on behalf of the authors,

Anneloes Ruifrok
Editorial comment to Author:

“I am happy that they have addressed the comments but now they have supplied the prospero number, the outcomes seem to be different (or rather there are more of them) in the registration compared to the review protocol. Can they explain why the outcomes differ between registration and full review? They at least need to include a comment as to why there are differences in the manuscript."

Our initial protocol in PROSPERO includes "critically important outcomes", that are provided in detail in our manuscript. We accept that it might mislead readers - we will modify our PROSPERO to ensure that this is adequately explained. We have now also clarified this in our manuscript and Table 3.

All changes made when revising the manuscript are highlighted using `track changes`.