Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Gestational diabetes mellitus: the optimal time of delivery." The comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our manuscript. We have studied the comments carefully and have made corrections, which we hope will be met with approval. The responses to the reviewer's comments are given below:

Reviewers' Comments

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: no comments to the authors.

Response: We greatly appreciate your time and efforts in reviewing our manuscript.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Well written manuscript. i congratulate authors for this well written manuscript. I recommend authors to organize the A1 GDM, A2 GDM and A3 GDM into more precise paragraphs (can be multiple).

Response: We are grateful for your professional review work on our article. Regarding language quality, we have polished the language in the revised manuscript and requested *Editage* for English language editing.

We have also added some subheadings to the A2 GDM and A3 GDM sections to organize the A2 GDM and A3 GDM information into more precise paragraphs, as per your excellent suggestion.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

(1)Science editor:

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it's ready for the first decision.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Response: We have improved the language of the manuscript, which can be seen as Track Changes in the revised manuscript. We earnestly appreciate the Editors/Reviewers' hard work and hope that the corrections will meet with approval.

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Diabetes, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must add a table/figure to the manuscript. There are no restrictions on the figures (color, B/W) and tables. Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s). Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/.

Response: We are very grateful to the Editor-in-Chief for reviewing our manuscript so carefully. According to your suggestion, we have added a figure to the manuscript. In addition, when we revised the manuscript, we searched the recommended RCA database to supplement and improve the highlights with the latest cutting-edge research results and further improve the content of the manuscript. Ultimately, we found no new articles that fit the content of our manuscript.