PEER-REVIEW REPORT

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	publication
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y] No	[ ] Minor revision
	[Y] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very extensive review but exceedingly long article.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	publication
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[Y] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y] No	[Y] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

• Portions on screening, diagnostic criteria, pathogenesis are extensive and well written.
• Under the section on diagnostic criteria, some information is repeated. • Management of GDM – A concise account on current recommendations by prominent professional bodies and thresholds for initiating oral anti-diabetic medications and insulin can be added. Also, a mention of landmark trials evaluating the efficacy of OHA in GDM can be added. Recent Cochrane meta-analysis of various management options like diet, OHA can be mentioned. • Neonatal comorbidities can be elaborated further.
• Grammatical errors need to be corrected. • Table 1 & 2 should be cited properly in the text.

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very comprehensive review of the various approaches to diagnosing gestational diabetes by an assortment of guidelines, the underlying genetics and biochemical changes associated with GDM, and a short section on management. It is quite authoritative but with a title such as 'A to Z' it should cover all areas of clinical interest. One area that is under-developed in the paper is a review of interventional clinical trials. and the fact that most of them have had limited success in preventing GDM in women at risk because the insulin resistance of pregnancy is so high and difficult to alter. A review of recent RCTs such as Upbeat and DALI and what they have taught us would be useful. Also, in the diagnostic biomarker section each adipokine or other molecule is dealt with individually. There is also the approach of more global proteomics and metabolomics looking at more complex signatures and their potential usefulness that could be mentioned. Finally, there is mention of the financial ROI of various screening criteria, but these are all based on obstetric and neonatal costs. It should also be mentioned that

the women with GDM is much more likely to develop Type 2 diabetes in the near future, and the offspring have an increased risk of childhood obesity and adult type 2 diabetes. Whilst it is more difficult to predict the overall cost savings over two generations, the likelihood should be mentioned that the ROI data are probably all low estimates.