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Reviewer’s report:

This is a retrospective cohort of women with GDM collected from many centers in Portugal. It is not obvious whether it is nation-wide or not. A subgroup of obese women with GDM was divided into three GWG classes according to IOM. Low and excessive GWG was evaluated in relation to recommended GWG concerning obstetric and neonatal outcome. The subject is of great interest.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? No
3. Are the data sound? It is not clear.
4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation? Yes
5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Not in the present status
6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Not in the present status
7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? No
8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Not applicable
9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? No, title should include “obstetric and neonatal outcome” and “gestational diabetes”
10. Is the writing acceptable? English is not my first language so I leave that question to someone else.

I have some Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. The title should be changed describing what the authors have studied, impact on obstetric and neonatal outcome. …impact of GWG in obese diabetic women on obstetric and neonatal… for example.

2. Abstract Conclusion: I suggest you reword this part. Do not repeat Results. The first sentence is nothing that you have studied, but could be kept in the end, maybe “possible modifiable” is better?

3. Methods: The national register of women with GDM must be described much more in detail (line 112-115). Is the register validated? How about missing data? In what way are the patients reported? The coverage of the register, the whole population of the country or not? Is there any reference that you could add
describing the register, especially one which includes validation too?

4. Methods: How was GDM diagnosed? In many countries and in-between countries there are huge differences in the definition of GDM. Methods: Was maternal weight and height self-reported? How about missing data on weight and height? I guess your inclusion criterion was available data on BMI. This should be described in the methods section before you define your cohort for further evaluation. This information is now in Results first part.

5. Results: I miss short information on the obstetric context where this study was performed. The prevalence of obesity? The prevalence of GDM? CS rates (to better understand whether 50% CS rate in the obese group is high or normal)?

6. Discussion: Line 203. What regular intervention program?

7. Discussion: Strengths and limitations of the study must be discussed.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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