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Dear Dr O’Donovan;

Thank you for considering our work for publishing in your esteemed journal. My colleagues and I were very delighted to receive the valuable comments of the respectable editorial board.

We made all the necessary changes requested by the editorial board; we hope they are acceptable, helping our study to be accepted in the BMC Pregnancy & Childbirth Journal. Following is point to point presentation of our modifications (written in red) in response to the received comments from both the editorial board and the reviewers:

- “The authors state and indicate in their study that the inverse relationship observed between Vit D and glycemic control is only observed among the patients with GDM. However, the correlation Figure clearly shows more than 80 data points which is what would be expected for the GDM group only. I count close to 160 data points with some obviously overlapping. Therefore the inverse correlations must be for the entire case-control dataset and include GDM as well as the control group. Please clarify and specify this relationship throughout the manuscript so that is is absolutely clear to the reader whether this relationship exists only for the GDM group, the control group or both groups together. This is critical for the manuscript.”  We revised the figure’s legend and, referring back to the master tables of data collection, we corrected it to include both groups together.

- “In the conclusion for the Abstract, please remove causal statements indicating the replacement of vitamin D and the possible prevention of GDM with VIT D treatment. These causal statements are not supported by the association data.”  Correction has been made accordingly (lines 63-67).
• “Also please remove any similar causal statements from the Conclusions in the Discussion since the study does not directly address causality.” Corrections made in text accordingly (lines 287-292).

• The comment on table 3 was also corrected after revision of the statistics and master tables, to include all the women participating in the study, not just those with GDM.

• Similar changes were accordingly made in the results section of the manuscript (lines 196 & 197).

On behalf of all my colleagues I would like to express my thanks to the editorial board members for their valuable comments and advices. We do hope that these changes will be satisfactory, help the publication of our study.

Thank you sir, please accept my best regards.

Yours sincerely;
Dr Yahia El-Faissal, M.D.
Lecturer, OBGYN department
Cairo University