

## **Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Water aerobics versus no exercise in pregnancy: cardiovascular response, labor and neonatal outcomes from a randomized controlled trial

**Version:** 1 **Date:** 22 August 2008

**Reviewer:** Pelle G Lindqvist

### **Reviewer's report:**

This is a well done randomized study comparing organized water aerobics to non exercise/non-organized exercise. It is a well written sound paper on an interesting topic. A sedentary lifestyle is the cause of many obstetrical problems. Thus, I believe that research regarding exercise during pregnancy is of high priority

However I have some points that I believe might improve the paper.

#### Major aspects

The authors refer their measurements of skin temperature as body temperature. They should throughout the paper use skin temperature. During exercise in pregnancy the skin temperature and measurement of body core temperature might not be identical, see Jones RL 1985 340.

The skin temperature rose at peak exercise and further on during the next 15 min. This is in opposition to results by Lindqvist pg 2003 152.

The difference between skin and core temperature might be interpreted as a safety mechanism during pregnancy exercise. This would give a possible explanation to the tendency towards increased skin temperature in the exercise group??

Did all women follow all scheduled water aerobics? Was it ascertained that the women not participating in the organized water aerobics did not exercise? Etc... I do miss a paragraph of the limitations of the study

#### Minor

I believe that a short description of the submaximal endurance test should be included in the paper and not only give a reference. In addition, I believe that the algorithms for VO<sub>2</sub> and MET should be given

If the authors have the BMI at partus or pregnancy weight gain during pregnancy this would

Table 1 I don't understand the lines Spontaneous vag delivery / C-section

In the results section the authors are using m1 vs. m2. This should be done throughout

I believe the design of the tables might be improved

In conclusion, an interesting work that I believe add to our knowledge.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**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