Dear Editors and Reviewers,

Thanks very much for taking your time to review this manuscript. We really appreciate all your generous comments and suggestions! Please find my itemized responses in below and my revisions in the re-submitted files.

Response to the referee's comments
Reviewer #1:
Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)
Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)
Conclusion: Major revision
Specific Comments to Authors: The authro sattempt to perform Metabonomics Fingerprint of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in Serum and Urine of Pregnant Women with Gestational Diabetes Mellitus using Mass Spectrometry The article is generally interesting but not written well for brevity Abstract and research highlights ar emore or less the same. They must be rewritten. The abstract could start with a strong rationale The introduction lacks succcinct details on VOCs and what is the ideal cutoff for VOCs. The reviews are not so good an dmust be revisited There must be a methodological flocwhart The language must be checked.

Response to Reviewer #1:

We are very grateful to your comments for the manuscript. According to your advice, we amended the relevant part in manuscript.

We rewritten the abstract and added flow chart, at the same time, we added a flow chart to the manuscript, finally asked the Editage to help polish the language.
We hope that the revised manuscript can express our research content more clearly and accurately.

Reviewer #2:
Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)
Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion: Accept (High priority)
Specific Comments to Authors:I am not sure whether form metabonomics is correct and maybe it should be replaced by metabolomics.

Response to Reviewer #2:
We are very grateful to your comments for the manuscript. we also found that the word metabolomics is more suitable for this manuscript by searching the literature and consulting relevant materials, so we modified the word metabonomics in the manuscript. And we have improved the image quality in the manuscript.

Reviewer #3:
Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)
Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion: Accept (General priority)
Specific Comments to Authors: godd

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Diabetes, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, "Figure 1Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...". Please provide decomposable Figures (in which all components are movable and editable), organize them into a single PowerPoint file. In order to respect and protect the author's intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright The Author(s) 2022. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA). RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/.

Response to Reviewer #3:
　　We have provided decomposable all Figures, organize them into a single PowerPoint file.

Dear Editors and Reviewers,

Thanks very much for taking your time to review this manuscript. We really appreciate all your generous comments and suggestions! Please find my itemized responses in below and my revisions in the re-submitted files.

We are very grateful to your comments for the manuscript.

1. According to your advice, we amended the relevant part in manuscript. " it should be metabonomics NOT metabolomics".
2. We provided the Figures cited in the original manuscript in the form of PPT. All text can be edited
3. We provided the correct Clinical trial registration statement file.
4. We removed all (5,7) self-citations.
5. We revised the title as required.