Thank you for the opportunity to revise this paper and address the important issues raised by the two reviewers of this paper. Below, please find how we attended to each comment. Thank you.

Reviewer A:
- **How the investigators ascertained Insulin dependent in women labelled as DM -I?? is it maintenance therapy with insulin by codes or cumulative doses??** We clarified in the methods section that this is a study of birth certificate data, and such, the only information we have are whether diabetes was pre-pregnancy or gestational, and whether it was insulin dependent. We have also discussed this as a limitation in the discussion section.
- **Can the author consider adding the term mellitus in the title to avoid confusion with other types of diabetes?** We have added this term.
- **Can the authors explain more the reliability of BMI in pregnant women?** We have clarified that BMI has been found to be reliable from birth certificates data when used in population-based surveillance.
- **Page 5: Materials and methods (please consider making a flowchart for better illustrating the cohort).** Without adding a flowchart, we have updated this section to make it more clear.
- **Page 6: please consider more elaboration on the statistical methods used in the study.** We have done this, while also adding additional analyses.
- **Consideration of the unmeasured confounders such as maternal co-morbidities in the limitations of the study.** This has been added.
- **In Table 1: Which inter-group significance represent the P values and mention the test used. Consider diving the table into one for the characteristics and another for the outcomes.** We have updated the methods section to clarify the p-values included in Table 1.
- **Minor errors: Page 4, line 3: consider replacing "supports the claim that there is evidence of" to showed. Page 4, line 7: there is an important gap to there is a gap or knowledge is lacking...... Page 4, lines 21-25: starts with Further, ...to women with GDM.(consider rephrasing as it is difficult to read).** This has been updated.
- **In the discussion section (please consider incorporating the paragraphs after comments into the discussion).** Done

Reviewer B:
- **This is an interesting retrospective study with great clinical significance.** Thank you.
- **1.In Table 1, the author used the chi-square test to find the relationships between different Diabetes categorizies and Demographic characteristics. However, it is not specific enough. Post hoc testing should be introduced to calculate the adjusted standard residuals so that determining the tendency of each group.** We added the Bonferonni adjustment to attend to this issue.
- **2. The author found that all demographic characteristics were related to diabetes categorizies (p<0.05) and the adjusted odds ratios (aOR) were calculated based on all demographic characteristics. The author could introduce Cramer's V coefficient to evaluate the degree of correlation between demographic characteristics and diabetes status. Only demographic characteristics with strong correlation could be included to calculate adjusted odds ratios.** This has been added to the analysis.