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Reviewer's report:

Comments for the manuscript: Associations between follow-up screening after gestational diabetes and early detection of diabetes – a register based study.

Discretionary revision:
A very relevant and needed study. Research is indeed lacking studies as this with long term follow-up after gestational diabetes. This could and be stronger emphasized by the authors. It is a great strength of the manuscript.

Major revision regarding references.
However, the article needs some further corrections and improvements;, especially the sloppiness regarding the references leaves a bad impression of the writing. Please go through every reference to see if they are cited correct. I here provide some examples, not a complete list of reference mistakes. In general for the online references: insert hyperlinks for ALL internet reports ect. and write when they were cited. It is important since internet pages are under constant development. Another general comment: All non-English titles should be translated and written in (English title). Non-Danish readers are chanceless and are in an unfair situation by your Danish citations.

More specific to the references: Ref 11. Something is wrong here. Where are page numbers, issue and volume? And it goes for ref 29 as well. Ref 3 looks strange too – what does the “2” stand for?
Ref 4 to 6: These are reports….please provide further information such as links or publisher.

The following is minor but very essential revision needed:

The text:
General comment: I would appreciate if the authors would provide further information on the registries they included. For non-Danish researchers it is unknown what registries are included and what kind of information every registry provides. Alternative, references for further description could be inserted such as the supplement in Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, which is cited.

The abstract: Please emphasize, that this study is only for a population living in the Region Nord. As it stands here you would think it is a national study.

Method part. You write that you adjust for income. Is the income variable included as a categorical variable (shown in table 1) or as a continuous variable?
I would strongly recommend that you make these adjustments using income as continuous. Even though I agree with your choice of confounders, I still need some arguments for your choice.

Result part: Text for table 2, there are numbers in the text that I can not find in the table. This is very confusing.

Another confusing part is the part belonging to table 3 and 4. The description for the two tables is collapsed, but I would really prefer if you split it into two separate descriptions. Alternative, you have to be more careful in guiding your reader when to look at table 3 and when to look at table 4.

The figure text for figure 2. You have to revise this. As it stands now it does not make sense.

Discussion part: In general for the discussion: A recent review came out in beginning of February this year focusing on barriers among women for gestational diabetes screening and barriers for type 2 diabetes postpartum screening. It would be relevant both at page 13 and 14 in the discussion. Full reference is given below.

Nielsen KK, Kapur A, Damm P, de Courten M, Bygbjerg IC. From screening to postpartum follow-up - the determinants and barriers for gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) services, a systematic review. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2014. 22;14:41.

The two lines just after ref 29 and before the heading “interpretation” starting with “A higher Proportion…..” What are you basing this assumption on? Meijer et al? I would compare my study population with national statistics on socioeconomic status. And this issue needs further elaboration. What does it mean in relation to your results?

Please elaborate on your point regarding fragmented care (down on page 14)

Despite my critical comments, I find the manuscript very interesting.
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