

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, the words "like amount" may be as "like the amount"; "between A and B" as "between the A and B"; "in in the" as "in the"; "population though" as "population"; "pre-pregnancy" as "a pre-pregnancy"; "state after" as "state"; "finding application" as "and finding application"; "with necessary" as "with the necessary"; "already from" as "from". The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly. 2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text. For example, the words "c-peptide" may be as "C-peptide (including title)"; "in turn" as "in turn,"; "insulin indicate" as "insulin indicates"; "mitogen activated" as "mitogen-activated"; "Non-receptor mediated" as "Non-receptor-mediated"; "soughtbefore" as "sought before"; "potential severe" as "potentially severe". The typos not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly. 3. Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words to be abbreviated. 4. The literature search should be described in detail. The authors are encouraged to include the database, search engines (like PubMed, ScienceDirect, Google scholar etc.), the keywords used etc., which may be included since it is a review article. A diagram depicted the literature search should be included. 5. In introduction, the authors may cite recent prevalence or incidence data about gestational diabetes and it should be at-least of 2022-2023. 6. The authors are encouraged to include a diagram related with insulin synthesis and secretion and its mechanism of action for better understanding. And also one table related with what are the biochemical markers (HbA1c, Fructosamine) used to diagnose gestational diabetes other than fasting, postprandial or C-peptide. 7. The reference cited in the conclusion section should be removed and it may be given in any other part of the manuscript. The conclusion should be key points of the overall observation of the review only and not with others. 8. The limitation of the present review

may be given along with conclusion or under separate heading for understanding the concepts clearly.

AUTHORS' RESPONSE

We thank the reviewer for his/her time spent and valuable comments and suggestions.

Answers

- 1,2. The text has been properly edited.
3. Certain abbreviations have been made.
4. The literature search has been properly described in the revised text and a relevant table has been added.
5. A relevant reference was added.
6. The relevant information has been incorporated into the text. Unfortunately, no table related with other biochemical markers could be produced. No systematic literature search was performed for this purpose.
7. Certain amendments have been made according to the reviewer's suggestions.
8. The limitations of the paper have been added.

Round 2

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. There are some grammatical, alignments and typographical errors are noted in the manuscript and it should be thoroughly checked and corrected throughout the manuscript. For example, the words "c-peptide (in title)" may be as "C-peptide"; "restrictions of this" as "restrictions on this"; "insulin indicate" as "insulin indicates"; "women in" as "women at"; "or alternatively" as "or"; "at late" as "at the late".

Thank you for the specific comments.

The word "c-peptide" in the title has been changed to "C-peptide".

The sentence that include "... restrictions of this ..." has been slightly changed. The verb "indicate" is correct because there are two subjects in the specific sentence (1. Loss of the clathrin coating and 2. conversion of proinsulin into insulin).

The terms "women in", "or alternatively", and "at late" have also been corrected (although some of them may have been right).