Reviewer’s report

Title: Socio-demographic inequalities across a range of health status indicators and health behaviours among pregnant women in prenatal primary care: a cross-sectional study

Version: Date: 24 April 2015

Reviewer: Debbie Smith

Reviewer’s report:

This is a packed paper with lots of information about health inequalities in one European Country. I think it should be published but have a few comments regarding the current form.

Major compulsory revisions
- The introduction is very short and could outline health inequalities in relation to education and ethnicity better to show why you focus your analysis on these two variables.
- The discussion needs to have some mention on implications of these findings, what can primary care do with these findings? what can be done to reduce these health inequalities?
- Why was a validated self-efficacy measure not used to measure ‘Health control beliefs?’

Minor essential revisions
- The aim line in the abstract needs to be reworded.
- The abstract has a lack of detail - eg., ‘what questionnaires?’ and what are the 10 health behaviours and what are the confounders?

Method
- Page 4, lines 102-3 - what does this mean that they had the possibility to mention any chronic diseases that they had?
- Page 5, line 117-118 - is this perceived or actual?
- Lines 132-133 - do you not need to know the units of alcohol consumed?

Results
- Page 6, why was there only a small percentage of women who overlapped in the first and second questionnaires?
- Page 7, what do you mean but highly educated?
- It is hard at points of the results section to picture the true number of women you are mentioning as you tell us a lot of proportion information in close proximity.

Discussion
Reference needed on page 10, lines 268-270 regarding lower incomes of migrant groups

Discretionary revisions

Abstract
- first line 'maternal' and 'pregnancy' do not both need to be used.
- What are the rates of nausea, back pain and passive smoking?
- Explain what you mean by the classification 'non-western women?'

Keywords
- Why is 'midwifery' featured?

Background
- There are quite a few bits in the background that need to be reworded - e.g., line 33, line 35, line 38 (immigrant status rather than 'being an immigrant') and 45 (how does this 'facilitate research'?)

Method

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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