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**Reviewer's report:**

This study surveyed the prevalence of Gestational Diabetes Mellitus (GDM) among pregnant Women Attending Antenatal Care at Gondar Town Public Health Facilities of Northwest Ethiopia and explored the risk factors for GMD. The topic is interesting; However, there are some unclear points that need further explanation.

1. Please provide the formula you used to calculate the sample size or give a citation.

2. Is there any difference between pregnant women who joined in the study and those who did not join in the study? What about the nonresponse bias?

3. Page 5, Lines 31-36. The author stated that some people were advised to take repeated test of OGTT, so what is the proportion of these subjects; and how did the author deal with results from two tests?

4. How did the recall bias or report bias was controlled?

5. Page 8, Line 14, what is "data summary mechanisms"

6. Page 9, Line 34, for "(P = < 0.001)", It is easy to generate ambiguity. Please put it another way

7. The largest limitation of this study is cross-sectional design, which restricted causal inference. How did the author deal with the reverse causation? any other limitation in this study?

8. Please show the full word of the abbreviation under each table or figure

9. Please show under the table confounders which were adjusted for variables

10. Need language modification.
11. Did the study have Ethical approval? If have, which committee approved it? Ethical Approval Code?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.