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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for granting me the opportunity to review this manuscript. It describes a knowledge translation tool with the goal of improving pregnant women’s knowledge of gestational weight gain goals and risks of inadequate and excessive weight gain. Overall the manuscript was well written and easy to understand. My comments are few and are indicated below:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. My major concern or point of clarification for this manuscript is the control group. More details are needed regarding the conditions of the prior historical completion of the survey. For example, why is the mean gestational age of enrollment survey 17.2 wks in the intervention group versus 30.9 wks in the control group. It is clear that eligibility criteria limited intervention group to those with care pre-20 weeks but this lag could lead to significant recall bias and bias the results in favor of the intervention group. This also needs to be addressed as a significant limitation of the study.

2. Although unstated, it would seem the authors think knowledge and/or discussions of patients with HCPs will translate to actual GWG recommendation adherence hence why it is seemingly important to improve knowledge and/or have patients interact with their HCPs on this issue . It would add to the manuscript to include actual GWG of the control and intervention groups. Similarly, this topic should be addressed in the discussion.

3. Discussion section would be enriched by commentary and supporting literature as regards the results that despite use of a knowledge translation tool, almost 50% of women in intervention and control group reported recommendations outside of guidelines. Additionally, two-thirds of women in each group planned GWG outside of recommended ranges. Are providers not providing correct counseling? Are women not recalling it correctly? If it is given correctly but not recalled correctly is that helpful? How do providers given memorable, impactful, actionable, recommendations?

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Lines 83-84 note fetal/neonatal and maternal risk of high weight gain as being high birth weight, trauma at birth, high blood pressure and diabetes. Recommend looking specifically at the maternal and offspring outcomes that were utilized to
derive the IOM 2009 GWG guidelines. It should be noted that preeclampsia and gestational diabetes were excluded due to insufficient evidence.

2. The sentence that extends from line 120-126 would be easier to read if broken into several sentences.

3. Delete the second half of the sentence on lines 215-216 regarding post-secondary education as it is redundant to what is in lines 218-221.

4. Would recommend adding to lines 241-243 not just what women ‘planned’ to gain but also their recollection of what they were told by providers (i.e. second section of Table 2)

5. Add gestational age at enrollment to table 1

6. Delete the portions of table 2 that address questions of comfort and satisfaction. These rows do not add significantly to the manuscript, it is not addressed in the text, and the table already takes up a significant amount of space for a relatively simple study.

7. Similarly, consider simplifying and/or consolidating tables 3a-3e as the amount of information conveyed does not justify the use of 5 tables and the associated space.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Consider avoiding redundancy of word ‘knowledge’ in title by changing to ‘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’ (could consider a similar suggestion throughout manuscript)

2. Consider adding word ‘goals’ after ‘(GWG)’ line 49 of abstract.

3. Consider going through and adjusting sentence structure so that more direct and with elimination of complex sentence structure with serial prepositional phrases. For example, the sentence that starts in line 167 rather than saying, ‘Other aspects of women’s knowledge of GWG,’ could be simplified to say ‘Other GWG knowledge aspects,’.
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