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15 January 2007

Dear Dr. da-Silva,

Re: MS 7273104501081313

Mild gestational diabetes in pregnancy and the adipoinsular axis in neonates born to mothers in the ACHOIS randomised controlled trial.

Thank you for the opportunity to further revise our manuscript. We appreciate the suggestions made by reviewer 1 to improve the manuscript and we have amended the manuscript in response to his further concerns. Detailed below point by point is our response to the issues raised.

As requested we have included the power calculation and checked that our revised manuscript conforms to the journal style.

Thank you for reconsidering our paper.

Wish best wishes
Yours sincerely

Professor Caroline Crowther

Reviewer 1 David Pettitt

1. Description of the study design.
The women included in this study were all those randomised to the ACHOIS trial at the Women's and Children's Hospital in Adelaide from whom it was possible to obtain cord blood samples (95/157). We have reworked the abstract and the methods section of the manuscript to make this clear. In the ACHOIS trial randomisation was stratified by centre and this was noted in the original trial report in the New England Journal of Medicine. This reference has now been cited in the manuscript.

2. In several cases the authors claim "tendencies" with non-significant p-values.
We have removed all references to non significant differences and replaced with phrasing such as "no differences were detected between the two groups".

3. There are discrepancies between the tables and text.
The tables and text are now consistent. In particular results after adjustment have been checked for consistency.

4. The conclusions are not fully supported by the data.
We have reworded the conclusions so that they are consistent with the data.