



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_22624
Title of the Manuscript:	DIABETES IN PREGNANCY STUDY GROUP IN INDIA (DIPSI) – A NOVEL CRITERION TO DIAGNOSE GDM
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Pregnancy outcomes are not evaluated in the study, although it is mentioned in manuscript "with good perinatal outcome." 2. How was the sample size calculated. 3. Other studies done in the same geographical region with larger sample size show contradictory findings. 4. Methodology needs to be elaborated. 5. Inclusion criteria, settings, location and relevant dates are not mentioned in methodology. 6. Similarly follow-up and data collection procedure need to be mentioned. 7. Eligibility criteria needs to be elaborated. 8. How were the patients selected. All women that is universal screening done in a time frame, or purposive sampling at a given gestational age was taken. 9. DIPSI and WHO Criteria should be elaborated in methodology instead of describing them in discussion. 10. How were these tests performed. 11. Associated risk factors like BMI, age, Parity which will be potential confounders and effect modifiers are not taken into account in the study.	1.my study is confined to comparison of two criteria in diagnosing GDM, so didn't evaluate pregnancy outcomes. As per studies done there was an evidence of good perinatal outcome. 2. all pregnant women of 24-28 wks of gestation who attended o.p from june 2015- sep 2015 OGTT is done by WHO CRITERIA. Those who were diagnosed as GDM IN this criteria were selected and asked to undergo GTT according to dipsi after 3 days. so we obtained 149 pregnant women out of them 63 were diagnosed as GDM by WHO. 3.Vijayalakshmi Udipi Badikillaya Dr Pinnamaneni Siddhartha Institute of Medical Sciences and Research Foundation (DrPSIMS & RF) Chinnaoutapalli Krishna District Andhra Pradesh 4,5,6,7.done 8.gestational age is taken for selection 10 done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	12. Follow up and pregnancy outcome in both groups is not mentioned. 13. At which gestational age the patients were selected for screening. 14. Studies with contradictory findings done in the same geographical region should be included in the discussion and reasons explained	11 added table1 12. follow up is not done as the study is done in short duration of 4mon where these GDM women didnt complete their gestational age. u/sg scan, anamoly scan were followed. 13.24-28 wks 14.viswnathan study is added
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		