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Re: MS: 1869116072143551 - Knowledge translation tool to improve pregnant women's awareness of gestational weight gain goals and risks of gaining outside recommendations: a non-randomized intervention study

March 11, 2015

Dr. Peter O'Donovan
Executive Editor
BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth

Dear Dr. O'Donovan,

We are pleased to submit a revised version of our paper, Manuscript ID 1869116072143551 titled "Knowledge translation tool to improve pregnant women's awareness of gestational weight gain goals and risks of gaining outside recommendations: a non-randomized intervention study." We appreciate the constructive comments from you. Please see below for our response to your comment.

Yours Sincerely,

Sarah D. McDonald, MD, MSc
Departments of Obstetrics and Gynecology (Division of Maternal-Fetal Medicine), Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, and Radiology
McMaster University, HSC 3N52B
1280 Main St. West
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L8S 4K1
Tel: 905-525 9140 ext 26559, Fax: 905-524-2911
mcdonals@mcmaster.ca

Editorial Comment

You reran the analyses forcing the variable 'women receiving the KT yes or no' into the model. However, it is still unclear to me why you used backward regression analyses for inserting the other variables. Neither in the introduction nor in the methods you explain why you would want to do this. All I read in the rationale for the study is that your aim is to evaluate the GWG tool and your main results describe whether the intervention group performed better on certain outcomes compared to a control group. The main aim of inserting other variables into the regression analyses is to control for confounders.

I have not come across studies before that combine enter and stepwise methods in one analysis. I would suggest to rerun the analyses and to insert all variables into the analyses using the enter method.

Response: We thank the editor for their feedback on the multivariable statistical analysis method. We have taken your suggestion to rerun the analyses using the enter method. We have inserted the new adjusted odds ratios into the abstract and results. In the methods, we have noted "Variables that were statistically significant in univariate logistic regression at \( p \leq 0.10 \) were included in the multivariable logistic regression model using the enter method" (lines 219-221). In Tables 3a-e, we modified the footnotes to reflect the new analyses, deleting the
footnote regarding the backward elimination procedure. As the new analyses do not change the conclusions of the study (i.e. the outcomes that the intervention group performed better on), we have not made changes to the discussion.