

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10061

Title: A1C at the first prenatal Visit in a Population at High Risk for Gestational Diabetes

Reviewer code: 01350278

Science editor: Song, Xiu-Xia

Date sent for review: 2014-03-11 19:10

Date reviewed: 2014-03-12 21:20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major concerns: The manuscript studied the utility of HbA1C at the first prenatal visit to detect the GDM in local population. The study used the ADA and WHO cutoff to divide over 300 subjects based on HbA1C levels and determine the risk of GDM and subsequent management. The study identified significant high detection rate of GDM with high Hb1AC group with over 200 time more likely to require medication. The results are interesting but the methodology of the study is not clearly enough for further interpretation. 1. although known diabetes were excluded from the study, but how about unknown diabetes? how they are excluded from the study then? Particular in group 1 patients, they are multipara with BMI <35, and HB1Ac level up to overt diabetes level before 28 weeks of gestation. Are they already has diabetes before this study? There is no exclusion criteria for the pre-existing undiagnosed diabetes however. 2. GDM diagnosis and medication were varied in different group. some require an opinion for GDM testing, but some are not. Some diagnosed GDM by Carpenter and Coustan method, but other by self-monitoring glycemic monitoring and goal. Timing of GDM test were also varied in different groups and based on the choice of subjects. Indication of medication was not standardised. There are so many variations will affect the results of the study. 3. as mentioned in introduction, Hb1AC levels is affected by anemia, hemoglobinopathies and some medications. Although the HPLC method used in this study was not affected by the first 2 factors, but the study has not clear exclusive criteria for the third factor. Minor concerns: 1. title: International recognised abbreviation of hemoglobin A1C (HbA1C) should be used. And the title is not justified by the aim and results of the study. 2. methods: it was mentioned logistic regression and odd ratios will be determined, but no such data was presented. 3. Table 1: BMI before or after



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

pregnancy? there is no GDM, diet control, medication, medication week, postpartum DM, pregnancy outcome data. there is no statistical analysis as well.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10061

Title: A1C at the first prenatal Visit in a Population at High Risk for Gestational Diabetes

Reviewer code: 00735749

Science editor: Song, Xiu-Xia

Date sent for review: 2014-03-11 19:10

Date reviewed: 2014-03-21 22:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to congratulate the authors with this manuscript. The problem highlighted here is interesting and always at the center of our attention. In general, this manuscript is well-written. There are just very few typos.