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Reviewer's report:

An interesting and relevant proposal for a systematic review. The planned methodology seems appropriate.

Some questions (Minor Essential Revisions):
- Do you also include studies of working women with physical disabilities or chronic diseases?
- EHealth interventions are often an add-on to face-to-face interventions; will a distinction be made in results of eHealth interventions carried out in stead of usual care and eHealth interventions in addition to usual care?
- An important functionality of eHealth interventions is the possibility for personalized feedback; should this functionality be a condition for the eHealth interventions to be included in the review?
- The number of planned subgroup analyses is relatively high, what is the rationale for these analyses and which subgroup analysis is most important according to current knowledge?
- Recently, a proposal within the same theme was published by the same group: Prince SA1, Reed JL, Nerenberg KA, Kristjansson EA, Hiremath S, Adano KB, Tulloch HE, Mullen KA, Fodor JG, Wright E, Reid RD Intrapersonal, social and physical environmental determinants of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity in working-age women: a systematic review protocol. Syst Rev. 2014 Nov 4;3(1):132. doi: 10.1186/2046-4053-3-132. Is it possible that the results of that review (Intrapersonal, social and physical environmental determinants) influence the effects of the eHealth interventions in this population?
- What is the reason to include grey literature (not peer reviewed)?
- “The Cochrane Collaboration’s tool will be used to assess risk of bias for each RCT”. That is clear, but some sentences later is written that “Risk of bias for the RCTs will be assessed using Review Manager (RevMan) 5.3.3”; please explain.
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