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Reviewer’s report:

I would like to complement the authors on this simple, well written, informative article. I only have two or three points to raise; otherwise I believe that the questions posed by the authors are well defined and that the data is sound. The figures appear to be genuine and the manuscript adheres to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition. I agree that the discussion and conclusions are well balanced and are adequately supported by the data. The authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building and the writing style is acceptable. I confirm that the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found. I particularly like that the authors sought feedback from the participants on the tool, which can be used in future versions. I feel that this is a very worthwhile area of research and look forward to seeing further work from this group.

Major compulsory revisions.

My comments mostly relate to the study design:

1. Please provide justification for the use of historical controls?
2. Moreover, are you confident that nothing will have changed, in terms of the treatment of pregnant patients, in that year gap? I ask this especially in light of your previous findings, highlighting the lack of advice provided. Is it possible that the HCPs changed their approach in that intervening year as a result of your previous work with them?
3. I would like clarification on the timeline of the administration of the tool and the survey in the intervention group please? Was the idea that they were recruited, provided with the tool and then surveyed? If so, then it is not surprising that this group reported higher levels of advice. Perhaps a better way to report and discuss this statistic is the uptake and use by the HCPs. Do you know why some of them did not interact with the tool? Do you have any HCPs generated survey data?

Discretionary revisions

My last small points relates to the first part of the results section, which has replicated data between the text and Table 1 that should be removed.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:
'I declare that I have no competing interests'