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Reviewer's report:

The authors present a protocol whose main purpose is "To identify existing prognostic prediction models for pregnancy complications in women with GDM".

They identify and cite the important templates, protocols, and guidelines for their methods and offer brief explanations for some.

They show a reasonably comprehensive draft search strategy.

I raise a minor and a major concern.

1. Two authors (SDC, LAW) will do the evaluation of the search results, choose the included studies, extract the data, and do the critical appraisal for bias. Disagreements will be resolved by consulting a third party, the senior author (HJT). HJT is the first author of a study possibly to be included (Teede HJ, Harrison CL, Teh WT, Paul E, Allan CA. Gestational diabetes: Development of an early risk prediction tool to facilitate opportunities for prevention. Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol. 2011;51(6):499-504). It is not permissible for the author of a possibly relevant study to be involved in anyway with the choice, data extraction, bias evaluation, study interpretation, etc of that study in a systematic review. I encourage the authors to explicitly detail the pathway for the management of any study who authors include those listed for this research project.

2. This is not a protocol for the prediction of GDM. Nor is it a DTA protocol for the diagnosis of GDM. The intended patient population includes: "GDM may have been diagnosed by any criteria". No discussion is given for the variability of these criteria for GDM diagnosis. Surely the criteria for diagnosis (strict vs non strict) must be a relevant covariate of a prediction model. I encourage the authors to anticipate and explain possible methods for incorporating GDM diagnosis criteria into the interpreting of model performance.
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