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Reviewer's report:

Given that the authors are unable to compare gestational weight gain across cohorts, it would be helpful to at least present typical rates of excessive gestational weight gain in Australia and compare that to the rate in cohort 3 where there is an adequate enough sample with recorded gestational weight gain.

Additional details about the implementation science approach that was used including findings from the surveys that were conducted would significantly strengthen the paper.

Additional details about the preceding work ahead of the 2014 survey (lines 83-89), whether they impacted gestational weight gain, how many participants used the booklets, etc. could be added to strengthen the paper.

On line 67, consider rephrasing the last portion of the sentence rely on accurate weight records for timely clinical interventions, such as referral to anaesthetists, for glucose tolerance testing, to dietitian. It is unclear as is.

Weight being recorded at booking visit should be included only in one table since the % are the same by person and by visit. It seems that it is a better fit in Table 2.

The mean week of gestation for weight booking is quite late into pregnancy and could mean that women are already on a trajectory by that point to gain excessively. This should be discussed as a limitation.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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