



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	Authors of this study compared the diagnostic utility of WHO and DIPSI criteria for screening for gestational diabetes in Indian women. It is demonstrated that both methods give almost identical results in this population. The manuscript is in general well-written, however, there are some significant concerns 1) I am not convinced that DIPSI is anyhow superior to WHO criteria. What is the advantage of measuring blood glucose only once after oral load irrespectively of previous meal? Measuring of fasting glucose is a standard first-step procedure in diagnosis of DM all over the world. If fasting glucose is elevated, there is no need to perform OGTT. So, I don't understand how DIPSI criteria could be superior to WHO criteria. 2) Line 42: this is not a prospective study because no follow-up observation was done. This is a cross-sectional study. 3) Line 120: it is stated that WHO criteria are "confusing". What is confusing in these criteria and how DIPSI criteria could be less confusing? It is also stated that WHO criteria do not give any information about perinatal outcome. Do DIPSI criteria give any information in this context? 4) It appears that equivalence of WHO and DIPSI criteria has been previously demonstrated by others. What are the really new findings of this specific study?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) Line 111: "HCS" should be explained	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jerzy Beltowski
Department, University & Country	Department of Pathophysiology, Medical University, Lublin, Poland