

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPCB_91846
Title of the Manuscript:	Gestational diabetes mellitus and the incidence of Diabetes mellitus post-partum – A Prospective study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajpcb.com/index.php/AJPCB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment.	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)																												
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>In ABSTRACT, the sentence "The study is aimed at estimating the postpartum prevalence of DM amongst GDM women and predict possible risk factors." there is a mistake, it is a postpartum incidence. When was the postpartum DM status of the participants determined ? Result: The postpartum prevalence, I think you mean incidence. In the last paragraph of Background, prevalence is recalled with incidence. In MATERIALS AND METHODS: It is not mentioned when the postpartum OGTT was collected and a well-structured questionnaire was given to the participants. I suggest putting this paragraph as a table "The diagnosis of diabetes was made using 75-g OGTT when one or more of the following results were recorded. Normal value: Fasting plasma glucose 60 to 100mg/dL, One-hour glucose level less than 200mg/dL, two-hour glucose level less than 140mg/dL; Impaired glucose tolerance: Fasting plasma glucose 100 to 125mg/dL, two-hour glucose level 140 to 200mg/dL; Diabetes: Fasting plasma glucose greater than 126mg/dL, two-hour glucose level greater than 200mg/dL". [10]</p> <p>The following Table summarises the 2006 WHO recommendations for the diagnostic criteria for diabetes and intermediate hyperglycaemia.</p> <p>Diabetes</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Fasting plasma glucose</td> <td>≥7.0mmol/l (126mg/dl)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2-h plasma glucose*</td> <td>or</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>≥11.1mmol/l (200mg/dl)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Impaired Glucose Tolerance (IGT)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Fasting plasma glucose</td> <td><7.0mmol/l (126mg/dl)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2-h plasma glucose*</td> <td>and</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>≥7.8 and <11.1mmol/l (140mg/dl and 200mg/dl)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Impaired Fasting Glucose (IFG)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Fasting plasma glucose</td> <td>6.1 to 6.9mmol/l</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2-h plasma glucose*</td> <td>(110mg/dl to 125mg/dl)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>and (if measured)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><7.8mmol/l (140mg/dl)</td> </tr> </table> <p>* Venous plasma glucose 2-h after ingestion of 75g oral glucose load * If 2-h plasma glucose is not measured, status is uncertain as diabetes or IGT cannot be excluded</p> <p>I suggest putting the approval number of Ethics Committee.. In RESULTS The data in table 2 should be placed in table 5 as risk factors. In Table 5, I suggest the following table because the chi-square was calculated:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Variables/ Groups</th> <th>nGDM (Mean±SD)</th> <th>GDM (Mean±SD)</th> <th>p-value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mother's Age (years)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Fasting plasma glucose	≥7.0mmol/l (126mg/dl)	2-h plasma glucose*	or		≥11.1mmol/l (200mg/dl)	Fasting plasma glucose	<7.0mmol/l (126mg/dl)	2-h plasma glucose*	and		≥7.8 and <11.1mmol/l (140mg/dl and 200mg/dl)	Fasting plasma glucose	6.1 to 6.9mmol/l	2-h plasma glucose*	(110mg/dl to 125mg/dl)		and (if measured)		<7.8mmol/l (140mg/dl)	Variables/ Groups	nGDM (Mean±SD)	GDM (Mean±SD)	p-value	Mother's Age (years)				
Fasting plasma glucose	≥7.0mmol/l (126mg/dl)																													
2-h plasma glucose*	or																													
	≥11.1mmol/l (200mg/dl)																													
Fasting plasma glucose	<7.0mmol/l (126mg/dl)																													
2-h plasma glucose*	and																													
	≥7.8 and <11.1mmol/l (140mg/dl and 200mg/dl)																													
Fasting plasma glucose	6.1 to 6.9mmol/l																													
2-h plasma glucose*	(110mg/dl to 125mg/dl)																													
	and (if measured)																													
	<7.8mmol/l (140mg/dl)																													
Variables/ Groups	nGDM (Mean±SD)	GDM (Mean±SD)	p-value																											
Mother's Age (years)																														

Review Form 1.6

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Mother's weight (Kg)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mother's BMI</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Offspring age (months)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>In the sentence "The women were followed up for a minimum of 2 years and longer. From our study, the postpartum prevalence of diabetes mellitus is shown in Table 3" there is a mistake, it is a postpartum incidence. In the paragraph after Table 3, "The development of diabetes postpartum were thus: At follow-up of GDM mothers, 35 mothers (72.9%) had Diabetes Mellitus [(15 prediabetes and 20 T2DM)] while 13 mothers (27.1%) returned back to normoglycemic state. For the nGDM mothers, 9 mothers (17.0%) had Diabetes [(7 prediabetes and 2 T2DM)] while a larger percentage of the mothers continued in their original state 44 (83.0%), 53(100.0). The result was significant statistically ($X^2 = 32.054$, 95% CI $p < 0.001$) in the prevalence of diabetes postpartum and GDM in mothers." The WHO 2006 Diabetes Diagnosis is not being used as shown in the table above. Because in this classification there is not prediabetes, only Diabetes, IGT, and IFG. The same occurred in Table 5. In DISCUSSION, there is this sentence "Our finding is in line with what was reported in South India where there was no significant relationship between maternal age and development of T2DM", but I cannot find the p-value to have this inference.</p>	Mother's weight (Kg)				Mother's BMI				Offspring age (months)				
Mother's weight (Kg)														
Mother's BMI														
Offspring age (months)														
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In MATERIALS AND METHODS: It is unclear how the participants received the well-structured questionnaire. In RESULTS: In Table 1. There is a term "Grandpara" I do not know. Please, put the meaning as a note.</p>													
Optional/General comments	<p>I suggest reading the article: BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2022; 22: 654. Published online 2022 Aug 19. doi:10.1186/s12884-022-04980-w. I think the formatting and English could be improved.</p>													

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Suzana Maria Ramos Costa
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brazil