

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Diabetes*

**Manuscript NO:** 78290

**Title:** Analysis Metabonomics Fingerprint of Volatile Organic Compounds in Serum and Urine of Pregnant Women with Gestational Diabetes Mellitus

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03547306

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Serbia

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-06-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-06-18 22:18

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-06-18 22:19

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="radio"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="radio"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="radio"/> Minor revision <input type="radio"/> Major revision <input type="radio"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

godd

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Diabetes*

**Manuscript NO:** 78290

**Title:** Analysis Metabonomics Fingerprint of Volatile Organic Compounds in Serum and Urine of Pregnant Women with Gestational Diabetes Mellitus

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02627243

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Poland

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-06-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-07-03 08:47

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-07-03 14:18

**Review time:** 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? YES 2  
Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript?  
YES 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? YES 4  
Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status  
and significance of the study? YES 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods  
(e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? YES  
6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study?  
What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field?  
YES 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and  
appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the  
findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite  
manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance  
and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? YES 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the  
figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the  
paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends?  
FIGURES, ESPECIALLY ROC-CURVES, COULD BE LARGER TO IMPROVE ITS  
READIBILITY (IN CURRENT FORM THEY DO NOT LOOK CLEAR) 9 Biostatistics.  
Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? YES 10 Units. Does the  
manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? YES 11 References. Does the  
manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the  
introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite  
and/or over-cite references? YES 12 Quality of manuscript organization and



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented?  
Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? YES 13 Research  
methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to  
manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) -  
Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study,  
Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist -  
Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement -  
Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The  
ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to  
the appropriate research methods and reporting? YES 14 Ethics statements. For all  
manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must  
submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their  
local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? YES  
(IT APPLIES TO PREVIOUS STUDY, BUT IN THIS CASE A NEW ETHIC STATEMENT  
IS NOT NECESSARY (IT IS A CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS STUDY, BUT USING  
OPTHER DATA) Your work is of very good quality. I have only few remarks: the first  
one is regarding abbreviations - all of them should be explained in the first use, and  
second - I am not sure whether form metabonomics is correct and maybe it should be  
replaced by metabolomics

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Diabetes*

**Manuscript NO:** 78290

**Title:** Analysis Metabonomics Fingerprint of Volatile Organic Compounds in Serum and Urine of Pregnant Women with Gestational Diabetes Mellitus

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05455317

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Senior Scientist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-06-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-07-02 04:21

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-07-12 03:19

**Review time:** 9 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authro sattempt to perform Metabonomics Fingerprint of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in Serum and Urine of Pregnant Women with Gestational Diabetes Mellitus using Mass Spectrometry The article is generally interesting but not written well for brevity Abstract and research highlights ar emore or less the same. They must be rewritten. The abstract could start with a strong rationale The introduction lacks succcinct details on VOCs and what is the ideal cutoff for VOCs. The reviews are not so good an dmust be revisited There must be a methodological flocwhart The language must be checked



## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Diabetes*

**Manuscript NO:** 78290

**Title:** Analysis Metabonomics Fingerprint of Volatile Organic Compounds in Serum and Urine of Pregnant Women with Gestational Diabetes Mellitus

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05455317

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Senior Scientist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-06-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ru Fan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-07-29 03:03

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-07-29 03:07

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous





**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ☐ ] Yes [ ☒ ] No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I am convinced with all the changes rendered. The authors made succinct/major changes. I regards to one of the reviewers' comments, and follow up of responses, I feel it should be metabonomics NOT metabolomics as it generates huge data