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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

This paper describes parts of the longitudinal TLGS study. Part of the results were already published, including a comparison between women with or without GDM, which were participants in this study - https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168822716307148?via%3Dihub. Obviously, the present paper gives more results, than the publication in the Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice 2017. However, I am wondering why it was not included as a reference. I would suggest to broaden the discussion section in relation with this and other similar publications.

Labels of the figure - what is this P-V interaction? Please, add an explanation.

Panel C of the Figure - according to the Table 1, the BMI is 29 and 27 at the baseline, but according to the figure both values are slightly below 29? There is some mistake here.

Panel B - What does it mean "Probability of being central obesity?". How it was calculated?

Panel A - What does it mean "Probability of being obesity?". How it was calculated?

Labels of the parts of the figure do not reflect what was presented. Please, see Panels D, E and F.

Panels G and H are missing.
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.

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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