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Reviewer's report:

1. The results of the study overall are interesting.

2. Methods and results are reasonably clear.

3. Language corrections are needed throughout the article including appropriate nomenclature of the groups - for instance better to say "1hPG was higher in the group with GDM recurrence compared to the group with no recurrence" rather than addressing the group as "recurrence group" or "no recurrence group". There are several grammatical errors throughout the article - especially the lack of use of articles.

4. Discussion needs major revisions
   a) Line 234 onwards - the speculation of why FPG is lower in group with recurrence is too far fetched and the possibility of a statistical phenomenon, missing data on maternal weight gain and weight gain between pregnancies/other confounders is a more likely possibility. Also adjustments for the above have not been made in the adjusted OR in table 3. Mechanistic connections to these clinical results should be avoided.
   b) Lines 252-257 are superfluous. It would be useful to replace this with references from clinical studies showing the same in GDM/prediabetes states.
   c) Limitations of study: lines 280 onwards: Should clearly mention the proportion of missing data of upto 32% pre-pregnancy weight and BMI in first pregnancy, 40% GWG, and around 30% missing weight gain between pregnancies. These are important limitations.

5. Nevertheless within the limitations of retrospective data - the most important results of the study remain the predictive ability of 1hPG and lipid profile. The focus should be on these 2 results and discussion needs rewriting.
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