



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 47586

Title: Association of hypoglycaemia in screening oral glucose tolerance test in pregnancy with low birth weight fetus

Reviewer's code: 00000663

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-20 07:29

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-22 22:31

Review time: 2 Days and 15 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A concise manuscript pinpointing the importance of fasting hypoglycemia and of hypoglycemia in response to OGTT as predictor of low birth weight (LBW) fetus. The analysis was carried out in a large cohort from an U.K. district hospital. The number of



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

LBW newborns was however low, but was largely clustered in the cohort with hypoglycemia. Data are sound, although not new. I have only a few suggestions for improvement. 1. The authors are invited to discuss the limits of the study. The proportion of women who were potentially at risk was approximately half the number investigated, which opens the question of selection bias. 2. The lack of BMI in the records excludes the possible role of obesity as risk factor for LBW. 3. It would also be important to assess the role of hypoglycemia on newborns small for gestational age (SGA), i.e. the possibility that hypoglycemia also impacts on preterm infants. 4. The effects of migration might be properly handled. The finding that women of Asian ethnic origin are more likely to have LBW babies should be eventually put in the context of first-generation or second-generation migration. 5. Something is missed in the third paragraph before conclusion: "Maternal is associated increase in"?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 47586

Title: Association of hypoglycaemia in screening oral glucose tolerance test in pregnancy with low birth weight fetus

Reviewer's code: 03648962

Reviewer's country: Pakistan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-20 10:52

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-26 03:50

Review time: 5 Days and 16 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In table 2 the authors have shown a highly significant p value but the values are showing a different scenario: $3,357 \pm 591$ * $3,480 \pm 515$ * $3,349 \pm 459$ * $P < 0.001$ I think they should double check the numbers, as there should be no difference here.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- [Y] No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- [Y] No