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Reviewer's report:

Craig et al. preformed a qualitative systemic review of 41 available studies, on the psychological impact of GDM diagnosis. I find the 2 previous reviews were quite thorough in their assessment, and overall, I think have contributed to the quality of the paper. I do have some minor suggestions, that once addressed will allow publications

1) The only major remark is that I disagree with the conclusion: "HCPs might carefully reconsider the current definition of GDM." As you explored the diagnosis of GDM, unrelated to its diagnostic methodology, lowering the threshold would still have an impact, and it is not in line with the pathological-physiological studies which have explored this. I would suggest to consider GDM diagnosis as the watershed line - your research is beyond that point and I would avoid discussing the issue of GDM diagnosis which is not in the scope of your study. Also, it seems you disregard your own findings of the positive behavioral effect of GDM diagnosis, which are important and valuable to a women's health, even if this causes "responsibility" and "financial investment", as it had important beneficial health effects. The appropriate conclusion would be to offer support to women with GDM and to reduce their numbers by altering the evidence-based diagnosis.

Some minor remarks:

2) "…BGL threshold associated with the risk of adverse infant outcomes (such as risk of macrosomia, excess infant adiposity and neonatal hyperinsulinemia)". The cutoff was actually set according the ORs for LGA and not for other risks. Please amend

3) "There is currently no globally accepted testing or diagnostic process…” - this sentence seems to be a redundant repetition. I suggest to omit it.

4) "…which led to the anomalous position that two women in two countries with exactly the same glucose levels may or may not be…." - I fail to see how this is relevant to your study, as its scope is not the methods to diagnose GDM. Many health-related differences exist between countries.
5) Please explain: "included pregnant women awaiting GDM screening or women with a current diagnosis or history of GDM" - it seems that awaiting GDM screening and History of GDM is not an appropriate inclusion criteria - rather only those with a diagnosis of GDM should be included
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