

Dear Editors and reviewers:

We appreciate your helpful comments and those of the reviewers. We feel that the manuscript (Manuscript NO.: 80064, Minireviews) is now greatly improved. We know our weakness that same topic paper or two meta-analyses has been published in this year, while the number of studies is small so that limited data are not enough to do the subgroup analysis. Four trials in six of the studies included between meta-analyses are the same. We put all studies together in a table and add a study recruited high-risk pregnant women including overweight and obese pregnant women. More details of related trials were qualitatively analyzed, which could be a strength of our manuscript.

We have made revisions based on the comments/suggestions of two reviewers, science editor and company editor-in-chief in our manuscript entitled " Probiotics for preventing gestational diabetes in overweight or obese pregnant women: A review". The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer's comments are as following:

Response to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer #1:

Comments: VErY well thought and need of the hour for preventing gestation diabetes for many pregnant women across globe.

Answer: Thank you for your comments and encouragement. We really appreciate your review and positive evaluation of our manuscript.

Reviewer #2:

Comments: Although the authors worked probably hard to write this review, unfortunately there is no novelty and nothing too useful for readers. The organization of the content within the paragraphs is lacking. The authors jump from a single study to results of meta-analyses or systematic reviews. There is no illustration of the mentioned data in a structured manner, like a concise Table. I would like to emphasize that there have been at list two

publications, this year, on the same topic: “Chu X, et al. Probiotics for preventing gestational diabetes mellitus in overweight or obese pregnant women: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS. Clin Nutr ESPEN. 2022” and “Obuchowska A, et al. Effects of Probiotic Supplementation during Pregnancy on the Future Maternal Risk of Metabolic Syndrome. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 2022 (which contains many data referring to gestational diabetes mellitus and not only), nicely organized and summarized and containing pertinent and useful data. In order to be useful for readers, this review should add something new, which could give it some value. I strongly advise the authors to reorganize their work and to insert new data, ideas, concepts etc. This is of paramount importance. Some examples of this current manuscript: 1. Abstract: The purpose/aim of this review appears by the end, while the results (findings) are written before the aim. The sentence “More large well-designed adequately-powered trials are needed to identify the influence of probiotics on plasma glucose and other maternal and neonatal outcomes in overweight/obese pregnant women in different countries.” should come in the end. 2. Introduction: Before the proper aim, the same sentence “More large well-designed adequately-powered trials are needed to identify the influence of probiotics on plasma glucose and other maternal and neonatal outcomes in overweight/obese pregnant women in different countries.” is written. 3. Conclusion contains the same sentence “More large well-designed adequately-powered trials are needed to identify the influence of probiotics on maternal and neonatal outcomes in overweight/obese pregnant women in different countries.” Please avoid redundant sentences and reorganize the content properly. Minor comments: 1. There is no Authors’ Contribution, no affiliations, no ORCID Numbers. Please insert. 2. Key words: It would be advisable to use other Key words, not those belonging to the title. This would increase the likelihood of the paper being found by readers. The importance of Keywords is to improve indexing.

Answer: Thank you for giving us the comments and helpful suggestions on

our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript accordingly. Firstly, we supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results. Secondly, we reorganized the content within the paragraphs and added a structured and concise table1 in our manuscript, which illustrated the mentioned studies of probiotics in the prevention of gestational diabetes in overweight and obese pregnant women. Finally, we read carefully about two publications on the same topic, studied their pertinent and useful data, and compared the differences between them and then added exact information in our manuscript. We reorganize our work qualitatively and insert new data, ideas, concepts in table 1 and main text. Our point-by-point responses are detailed below.

1. Abstract: The purpose/aim of this review appears by the end, while the results (findings) are written before the aim. The sentence "More large well-designed adequately-powered trials are needed to identify the influence of probiotics on plasma glucose and other maternal and neonatal outcomes in overweight/obese pregnant women in different countries." should come in the end.

Response: We are extremely grateful to reviewer for pointing out this problem. We are very sorry for our mistakes about inappropriate describe in the abstract, as main text.

2. Introduction: Before the proper aim, the same sentence "More large well-designed adequately-powered trials are needed to identify the influence of probiotics on plasma glucose and other maternal and neonatal outcomes in overweight/obese pregnant women in different countries." is written.

Response: We really feel sorry again on the mistakes and reorganized the content properly.

3. Conclusion: contains the same sentence "More large well-designed adequately-powered trials are needed to identify the influence of probiotics on maternal and neonatal outcomes in overweight/obese

pregnant women in different countries.” Please avoid redundant sentences and reorganize the content properly.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We have dropped redundant sentences carefully in main text.

Minor comments:

1. There is no Authors’ Contribution, no affiliations, no ORCID Numbers. Please insert.

Response: We deeply appreciate your comment. We have added the information of authors’ contribution and ORCID numbers of all authors. Affiliations are improved in authors’ information.

2. Key words: It would be advisable to use other Key words, not those belonging to the title. This would increase the likelihood of the paper being found by readers

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We agree with your comment and have revised the key words according to the main text and mesh terms.

Revision reviewer:

Major comment: Conclusion is too long. Please re-write it and make it short and crispy. Also, conclusion should not include references. Please correct. Also, I do not understand why Conclusion has references starting with [1] until [27] and Introduction starts with references [6,41,51]. References should be numbered in their order of appearance in the text.

Response: We really feel sorry that the introduction and conclusion could be unlocated oppositely during submitting texts process. In fact, the manuscript file what I downloaded was correct, so I am also confused about the problem. But I have corrected the texts and deleted the references in conclusion. Please review again.

Minor suggestions: Table 1 – Please add numbers of the References. Please use a pertinent criterium for the insertion of the studies (e.g. year of publication or alphabetical order).

Response: Thank you for your suggestions. We have added numbers of the references and relisted the studies by year of publication in table 1.

Science editor:

We appreciate your review and the first decision made for us.

Company editor-in-chief:

Response: We would love to thank you for allowing us to revise and resubmit our manuscript to the World Journal of Clinical Cases. According to your comment, we have added a table to the manuscript and improved the content of our manuscript. Most important of all, we apply the tool of the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA) by your advice, supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results.