

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 15466

Title: Pregnancy and Neonatal Outcomes in Indigenous Australians with Diabetes in Pregnancy

Reviewer's code: 02446526

Reviewer's country: Afghanistan

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-11-28 13:47

Date reviewed: 2015-01-08 20:34

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Review comments for Manuscript "Pregnancy and Neonatal Outcomes in Indigenous Australians with Diabetes in Pregnancy - ESPS Manuscript NO: 15466" General comments: The topic is relevant to the scope of World Journal of Diabetes and to the diabetologists/ internists especially in the Australasian region. However there are few methodological flaws and technical errors in the manuscript that needs thorough modifications to improve the scientific quality of the paper. There are some language and syntax errors throughout the manuscript that needs rectification (e.g., "DIP infants", "DIP versus non-DIP outcomes", "DIP women", "non-DIP Indigenous counterparts" etc). Some of the technical errors are pointed out below. Abstract: Methods section should mention inclusion and exclusion criteria briefly. The sentence starting with "Birth data from midwifery registries.." in the results section should have been in the methods section. Main text: Introduction: Reasonably well written, although it should have mentioned if there is any available evidence on adverse outcomes in DIP in the region. This forms the rationale for the study by the authors. It is also worth mentioning the world scenario with one or two references on the topic (as health inequalities

are relevant globally). **Methods:** The inclusion and exclusion criteria are not clearly defined. It is not clear from the paper if the authors reviewed the full text of the articles and assessed the references of relevant studies/ review articles for any other potential studies. Authors do not mention the methodology they used to perform the systematic review. Ideally the systematic review should follow the PRIMA Guideline for literature search and reporting. The quality assessment of the included studies is missing in the paper. Quality assessment (QA) is important in systematic reviews and the authors should use one of the QA tools such as New Castle Ottawa Scale for QA. If this is not possible the merits and demerits of individual studies should be mentioned (as in the SR reported by Clark ML et al. in the World J Diabetes previously – World J Diabetes. 2014 Jun 15;5(3):296-304. doi: 10.4239/wjd.v5.i3.296.). **Results:** A flow diagram of the data extraction should be included in the results section. Please ensure that relevant statistical parameters examined in individual studies are clearly quoted in this section (I don't have access to the full texts of some of the papers). **Discussion:** There are few syntax errors (as mentioned in the general comments) in this section that needs addressing. Re-reading the manuscript and re-framing some of the sentences would improve the language quality. It would be worth mentioning the merits of this paper in the beginning of discussion and limits before the conclusions. Comparison of the situation of health inequalities in other regions of the world with some good references shall improve the quality of discussion. The last paragraphs of the discussion (before conclusions) should have been mentioned in the introduction with relevant references and the lack of data as a limitation of the article/ focus for future research. **References:** Should be cited according to the style of World J Diabetes author guidelines. The references cited are reasonable to the paper (with additional references to be included as needed for the revision, if authors decided to revise)

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 15466

Title: Pregnancy and Neonatal Outcomes in Indigenous Australians with Diabetes in Pregnancy

Reviewer's code: 02446525

Reviewer's country: Afghanistan

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-11-28 13:47

Date reviewed: 2015-01-08 17:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

None