

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_110885
Title of the Manuscript:	Pregnancy Outcomes in Diabetic Mothers With Controlled Glycemia: A Case-Control Study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The manuscript states the importance about the controlling of patients with gestational diabetes mellitus either by nutritional ways or by using treatments as the complications of uncontrolled GDM is considered a burden on the social community as well as the health organizations.2. Yes, the title is suitable.3. The abstract is comprehensive but it's too long for an abstract as it exceeds 300 word, also some of the results are not clear and confusing4. The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate, with an overall view about the disease and mention of the prevalence statistics of mortality and morbidity rates, the investigations and lines of treatment of diabetes, the objectives of the study was clear, as well as methodology of how the study was done with statistical analysis, but the results were not clear, misleading confusing and lead to misunderstanding, it is advisable to make it more clear, concerning discussion, the comparison with other studies was apparent but with no citation in the text to the references, or may be mentioned in the references but not cited in the text5. Scientific Correctness: the manuscript is scientifically corrected6. Sufficiency and Recent References: The references are sufficient but appear to be not recent as most of them are not updated, it's advisable to ensure that the most up-to-date literature is included7. Concerning the tables mentioned below at the end of the manuscript, it is better to retype the tables as its format was not clear and difficult to understand	<div>Noted</div> <div>Amended revision</div> <div>Done</div> <div>Revised</div>
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication, and the manuscript is free of grammatical or language issues that would hinder understanding of the article, it is advisable to use correct abbreviations and mention them	ok
Optional/General comments	MTP was not mentioned before HBA1C in correct abbreviation	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	