



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 55591

Title: Prevalence of anxiety among gestational diabetes mellitus patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer’s code: 05207387

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DSc, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: South Korea

Author’s Country/Territory: Malaysia

Manuscript submission date: 2020-04-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-23 12:01

Reviewer performed review: 2020-04-27 01:22

Review time: 3 Days and 13 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study pooled data from existing literature to determine the pool estimates for the prevalence of anxiety among women diagnosed with gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM). This study is a meaningful meta-study and has been well described overall. However, there are some changes that need to be made. My opinion is as follows.

1. (Introduction) In the introduction section, the author should describe the trends in pre-study on GDM and depression and anxiety.
2. (Materials and Methods) "(3) Studies were published in English peer-reviewed journal from inception to 31 October 2019." In the Inclusion criteria section, is all studies before 31 October 2019 included?
3. Page 3, line 32: The source for the utilities (eg. Endnote programme X5 version) should be presented.
4. (Quality assessment) Quality assessment is very important in meta-research. A more specific explanation is needed for the checklist of Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE).
5. (Statistical analysis) I suggest that the authors present a funnel plot to evaluate the publishing bias. It will help many scholars refer to this study in the future.
6. (Results) It is thought that there will be a limit to producing meaningful results in meta-research with just three studies. However, if few studies have been reported, I think that analyzing meta-study with three studies is not wrong. However, this should be described in detail as the limitations of the study in the Discussion section.
7. (Results) What does the arrow in Figure 2 mean? In addition, the number of samples from one study (Beka et al., 2018) is so large that it greatly affects the results of meta-analysis. If you had enough previous studies, you can perform a subanalysis. If you analyze without one study (Beka et al., 2018), it is highly likely that the results of the meta-analysis will be derived differently. This should be fully explained as a limitation of the study in the discussion section.
8. (Discussion) In the first paragraph, the author overemphasized the results of meta-analysis. As noted



**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

earlier (number 7), this meta-analysis has many limitations. A modification is required.