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Reviewer's report:

The current edited version heeded the comments of the previous reviewers. The resultant manuscript is an excellent contribution to the literature concerning women's psychosocial experiences of receiving a GDM diagnosis if some substantive changes are made. There is a clear bias exhibited by the authors against the clinical utility of the diagnosis and treatment of GDM, despite evidence from multicenter trials that support the benefits of treating even "mild" forms of GDM (the ACHOIS study by Crowther, et al.; the MFMU network study in the US, etc.). These were well-executed randomized controlled trials and yet, the authors of this manuscript counter such evidence with citations of "pre/post studies" (a very weak research design) and a qualitative report of 19 women who viewed "treatment for their borderline condition 'unnecessary". I am not saying that the views of the women from this citation are not important, but such qualitative data does not support the refutation of quantitative outcome studies; rather, the objectives of such a qualitative study are completely different.

The qualitative synthesis performed by the authors is very well done, with the exception of conclusions made that are not warranted by the qualitative data. The authors state conclusions concerning methods of diagnosis and manner of treatment that is NOT the focus of this study. If they would stick to the focus of their study and make conclusions based on this focus, this manuscript would be well worth publishing. In the conclusion, they cite outdated literature (for example, Goer, 1996) that is not original research or even from a journal that is peer-reviewed. If the authors would stick to making conclusions about their own data, this article has great potential.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown? 
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review? 
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