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1. Major Compulsory Revisions

None

2. Minor Essential Revisions

The authors need to define a positive oral glucose challenge test as well as normal OGTT. How did they classify women with one abnormal value on their OGTT?

3. Discretionary Revisions

I would have liked the authors to have included a second comparison group – women with diagnosed and treated GDM. It would have added an additional perspective to help interpret their results and would increase interest in their findings.

I am unclear as to the value of the composite outcomes. They included outcomes that are so diverse that they have little clinical meaning.

4. Recommendation

- Accept without revision
- Accept after discretionary revisions (which the authors can choose to ignore)
X Accept after minor essential revisions (which the authors can be trusted to make)
- Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions
- Reject because scientifically unsound
- Reject because too small an advance to publish (note that BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth will publish all sound studies including sound negative studies)
5. Level of interest
- An exceptional article (of the kind that might have warranted publication in such journals as Nature, Cell, Science, New England Journal of Medicine, British Medical Journal)
- An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field (of the kind that might be found in the leading specialist journal in its field, such as Immunity, Development, Journal of Clinical Investigation, Gastroenterology)
- An article of importance in its field
X An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
- An article of limited interest
- An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

6. Quality of written English
- Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
- Needs some language corrections before being published
X Acceptable

7. Statistical review
Is it essential that this manuscript be seen by an expert statistician?
- Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
X Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
- No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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