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Author’s response to reviews:

Authors response to reviewer’s comments:

(All the revisions made to the original manuscript are highlighted).

1. Figure 1 is not included in the manuscript therefore unable to review fully
Response: The authors apologize for not including the figure. Figure 1 is now included in the manuscript.

2. In Table 2 the BMI is also significantly different between the groups. Please comment on the fact that vitD def is also associated with BMI and the potential to be a confounder in this study.

Response: We thank the reviewer for pointing out the confounder role of BMI/obesity. The significant associations identified in our analyses between BMI and related indices of obesity with GDM are now included in both results and discussion.

3. The abstract states that the fact that 116 of 419 participants were diagnosed with GDM "This suggested a 2.87 fold higher risk of development of GDM among vitamin D deficient…” It is not clear how this latter conclusion is related to the former result. Please reword.

Response: The sentence has been reworded as requested by the reviewer.

4. It is probably more appropriate to use the term "nonGDM" rather than "normal" since there may always be other unidentified confounders or disease states not listed here.

Response: In all the comparisons, we have replaced ‘normal with non-GDM’, as suggested by the reviewer.

5. Table 1 is not necessary as these numbers are easy to list in the text.

Response: Table 1 has been removed, as suggested by the reviewer, while retaining the contents of it under “Results”.

6. Any discussion of why the rate of GDM in this cohort (or in Saudi population as a whole) is so high (>28%) would be helpful. In addition the high rate of vitamin D deficiency should be discussed further.

Response: The potential reasons for both the high rates of GDM and vitamin D deficiency in this cohort are now included in the discussion.
7. I suggest that the data from "comparison of maternal and biochemical parameters of GDM women with normal women" should be put in a table. Very difficult to read in the text.

Response: The data presented in results under “comparison of maternal and biochemical parameters of GDM women with normal women” is presented in Table 1 under respective categories.