Prediabetes and cardiovascular complications study - 'invited review' manuscript R1

Our responses are in blue

The paper has some interesting data and insights, but it should be restructured, so that it is easier to understand the message. First of all, as there are several studies reported in the paper, the information on them should be structured in a way that the reader clearly sees in which section data from which study is presented and a more straightforward connection between them is necessary. A brief description of these studies (number of participants, regions, period, goal and procedures) should be provided in a systematic manner. The sections between introduction and discussion should be divided in a way that the reader can distinguish between materials and methods, and results parts of the paper. A Materials and Methods section is added, and a paragraph inserted for clarification.

By the end of the paper it is still unclear, what is the particular place of GDM in all the studies and what is the core finding of the paper (supported by the data). The language should be revised. The authors have revised the manuscript kindly see track changes.

Some sentences are hard to read and there is a terminology not suitable for scientific papers (e.g. "gravida", "blue collar jobs" etc.). Gravida is a medical and physiology terms however this has been explained in the text, kindly see page 7 and Table 2. References to white collar and blue-collar jobs has been amended in text, see pages 9 and 10 and Figure 4.

The concept of behavioral change wheel should be described in the paper. This is now explained on page 5 of manuscript.

The list of stakeholders mentioned in the paper should be formalized A list has been made and added on pages 13 & 16 and it is also in the box on 'Core tips'.

The estimations of 55 million healthcare workers in diabetes care required for Nigeria healthcare system is doubtful. A more careful analysis on this point is required This section has been re-written kindly see page 12.

In the description of each figure and table the information on a particular study to which this figure/table refers is necessary (otherwise it might be unclear for the reader, e.g., why are there male responders in GDM study). All the figures should be simple bar/pie graphs (and not 3d versions) in order to make it easy to read percentages. Fig. 3 does not carry any meaningful information. In table 2 it is doubtful that kurtosis and skewness have any meaning for presented metrics. These concerns have been attended. For instance, 3D format of figure 4 has been reformatted. A footnote statement of description has been appended to each figure. Kurtosis and skewness have deleted on table 2.