

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** This is a nice retrospective study on prediction model for gestational diabetes mellitus. Early prediction of GDM can result in timely interventions in patients and improve pregnancy outcomes. So in this study, authors examined various risk factors associated with GDM and established and compared two prediction models: the nomogram model and the random forest model. They found that the random forest model is superior to the nomogram model in predicting the risk of GDM, and can accurately assess the risk of pregnancy-related diabetes. The topic of this work is interesting. In general, the article is helpful for early diagnosis and appropriate intervention of diabetic pregnancy and the results are interesting and could be useful for other studies. Editing and proofreading are needed to maintain the best sense of reading. Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to review. I have really appreciated the discussion section.

Response#1: Thank you for your review and your valuable feedback. Regarding your suggestion for editing and proofreading, we will carefully review the manuscript to ensure the best sense of reading.

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** This is a concise and thorough study, which would provide an essential reference for researchers in this field and the results are interesting and could be useful for other studies. In addition, the manuscript also introduces the limitations of the research and the direction of follow-up research. I really thank for this well-designed study because it presents a detailed description of optimal analysis, discussion, tabulation and graphic display of data. I have no further comments and recommend it to be published in this journal.

Response#2: Thank you for your positive feedback and for considering our study to be of very good scientific quality. And also appreciate your recommendation to publish our manuscript in this journal. We have rechecked the content and language of the manuscript to improve quality.

Dear Editor-in-Chief and Editorial Director,

Thank you very much for your comments,

We have revised the manuscript based on your comments, and our response is as follows,

Best Regards,

Zhuan-Ji Fang,

1. In this study, the authors stated the hemoglobin (Hb) was found as one of the top five risk factor for predicting GDM thorough the manuscript. However, when they discussed Hb in the section of discussion, in all cited references of 16-18 glycated hemoglobin level was used. Therefore, the authors need to clarify whether the authors measured or collected Hb are total hemoglobin or specifically glycated hemoglobin since these two variables totally mean different things;

Response: The Hb measured or collected in this study is total hemoglobin. At the same time, we have revised the references

2. Page 10/25: The authors have mentioned, "The peculiarity and novelty of the research methods lie in the adoption of machine learning methods, which greatly improve the accuracy and reliability of the model." If this was the 2 case, the authors should mention it with brief description in the section of Materials and methods.

Response: We have supplemented it in statistical analysis.

3. Figure 1. (1) Please correct "Pre-pregnancy"; (2) Please change "ngm/L" to "ng/L" to keep it consistent with the way in Tables 1 and 3; Please double check "Hb" or "Hb Yc"

Response: (1) Changed to "Pre-pregnancy"; (2) Changed to "ng/mL"; (3) "Hb"

4. Table 2. Please justify the column larger to ensure "Whether GDM occurred (dependent variable)" or "First-trimester fasting hyperglycemia" in the one line to avoid the potential confusion to read them as different items in different lines. Similar issue for Table 3 if possible.

Response: The above problems have been changed