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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper describing the methods and outcomes of development work on a self-management intervention for pregnant women. It is clearly written and comprehensive.

I have a few comments regarding the structure of the paper and layout.

1) Currently it is not clear how the methods led to the results, how the methodologies employed are linked to the new version of the intervention as describe in the Results section. Some additional signposting within the paper may make this more obvious and perhaps moving a few sections around. For example the methods to develop a logic model should be in the methods and the description of the model with respect to its components should be in the Results.

2) Taking this point further, the methods used to do the development should be in the Methods and the outcomes/outputs described in the Results which then finish with a description of the resulting intervention.
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