

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_111966
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON OF GLYCATED ALBUMIN LEVELS AMONG WOMEN WITH GESTATIONAL DIABETES MELLITUS AND WOMEN WITHOUT GESTATIONAL DIABETES MELLITUS
Type of the Article	Original article

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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1-Yes, The topic is interesting. Could be used for management of GDM especially for the patients who are on diet and exercise regulation. It will allow rapid shift in treatment as the time period for glycated Albumin is less than HbA1c.</p> <p>2- The Title needs to be revised according to the Methodology. Title is suggesting it to be a case control study but it is a cross sectional study. May be they can rewrite it as, Efficacy or Accuracy of GA in pregnancies complicated with GDM, OR can modify in their own way to make it more pronounced with the methodology and results.</p> <p>3.Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Manuscript need more revision in terms of its methodology and results, as Author has mentioned it as the comparison with women without Gestational diabetes but in results only one bar diagram is present for comparison which is not sufficient and does not provide any link with the results. The sample size is not mentioned properly (how many non GDM subjects were participated in this study). Exclusion criteria and inclusion criteria for the non GDM is also not set. Patient's HbA1c is much required bio marker in GDM, if reported may provide the additional information and further supports the objective of the research. The Author should provide the clear information regarding the diagnosis of GDM, whether the cases were already diagnosed by OGTT or by glycated Albumin only. The methodology for preparation of the patient is controversial (Fasting is required or not, is it same like OGTT).</p> <p>5. Some more recent references can be added. (after year 2020)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Good</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shabina Anjum
Department, University & Country	Taibah University, Saudi Arabia