Dear reviewers,

We thank the reviewers for the constructive comments and suggestions, which were helpful for improving our work. In accordance with these suggestions, we have modified the manuscript. Our responses to the comments on the manuscript are as follows:

In General: it's a good paper and the subject of the manuscript is applicable and useful. Congratulations on completing your work and disseminating the results. I have some feedback intended to be helpful, and I wish you the best of luck in your ongoing research. Take care. Title: the title properly explains the purpose and objective of the article Abstract: abstract contains an appropriate summary for the article, the language used in the abstract is easy to read and understand, and there are no suggestions for improvement. Introduction: authors do provide adequate background on the topic and reason for this article and describe what the authors hoped to achieve. Results: the results are presented clearly, the authors provide accurate research results, and there is sufficient evidence for each result, Specific data accompany the result statement, and Tables and figures are used efficiently. Conclusion: in general: Good and the research provides sample data for the authors to make their conclusion. Grammar: There are a lot of grammatical errors. This must be taken care of and addressed.

Thank you very much for your constructive feedback on our manuscript titled "Circulating Glycated Albumin Levels and Gestational Diabetes Mellitus: A Meta-Analysis." We are delighted to hear that you found the subject of our study
applicable and useful, and we appreciate your kind words regarding the completion and dissemination of our work. We are particularly pleased that you found the title appropriate, the abstract easy to read and understand, the introduction adequately detailed, and the results clearly presented with sufficient evidence and efficient use of tables and figures. It is reassuring to know that our research provides a solid basis for our conclusions. Regarding the grammatical errors, we acknowledge the need for improvement in this area. We have reviewed the manuscript and address all grammatical issues to ensure the highest standard of clarity and readability. We value your feedback greatly, and we are committed to making the necessary revisions to enhance the quality of our manuscript. Thank you again for your insightful comments and best wishes.
The manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) and the potential role of glycated albumin (GA) as a biomarker for its prediction. Here are some points to consider for peer review:

Clarity and Organization: The manuscript is well-organized, with clear sections delineating the introduction, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. This structure aids readability and understanding.

Relevance and Importance of the Topic: The manuscript effectively establishes the significance of GDM as a medical complication in pregnancy and highlights the potential impact of GA as a predictive biomarker. This relevance is crucial for both clinicians and researchers in the field of obstetrics and gynecology.

Literature Review and Rationale: The literature review provides context for the study, citing relevant statistics and previous research on GDM and biomarkers. However, it could be strengthened by including more recent studies and meta-analyses to support the rationale for investigating GA in the context of GDM.

Methods: The methods section is detailed and transparent, outlining the search strategy, inclusion and exclusion criteria, data extraction process, and quality assessment. This transparency enhances the reproducibility of the study.

Data Analysis and Presentation: The manuscript employs appropriate statistical methods for meta-analysis and presents the results clearly with tables and figures. However, it would be beneficial to provide forest plots for individual studies included in the meta-analysis to visualize effect sizes and confidence intervals.

Discussion: The discussion section thoroughly explores the implications of the findings and
compares them to existing literature. It acknowledges the limitations of the study, such as small sample sizes and potential publication bias, while also highlighting the strengths of GA as a biomarker for GDM. Conclusion: The conclusion effectively summarizes the key findings and emphasizes the importance of further research in this area. However, it could provide more specific recommendations for future studies, such as exploring optimal cutoff values for GA in GDM prediction and addressing potential confounding factors. Language and Style: The manuscript is generally well-written, but there are some instances of repetitive phrasing and complex sentence structures that could be simplified for clarity. Additionally, ensuring consistency in terminology and formatting throughout the manuscript would enhance readability. References: The manuscript appropriately cites relevant sources to support its arguments and claims. However, it would be beneficial to ensure that all references are up to date and accurately cited according to the chosen citation style. Overall, the manuscript provides valuable insights into the potential role of GA as a biomarker for GDM prediction.

Thank you for your thorough and constructive feedback on our manuscript titled "Circulating Glycated Albumin Levels and Gestational Diabetes Mellitus: A Meta-Analysis." We are grateful for your insights and suggestions, which will undoubtedly enhance the quality and clarity of our work. Based on your comments, we have made the following revisions and improvements: Literature Review and Rationale: We have strengthened the literature review by including more recent
studies and meta-analyses. This additional context supports the rationale for investigating GA as a predictive biomarker for GDM. Data Analysis and Presentation: We have added forest plots for individual studies included in the meta-analysis. These visualizations help to illustrate effect sizes and confidence intervals more clearly.

Discussion: We have expanded the discussion to provide more specific recommendations for future studies. These include exploring optimal cutoff values for GA in GDM prediction and addressing potential confounding factors. Language and Style: We have reviewed the manuscript for repetitive phrasing and complex sentence structures, simplifying them for better clarity. Additionally, we ensured consistency in terminology and formatting throughout the manuscript to enhance readability.

References: We have updated and verified all references to ensure they are up to date and accurately cited according to the chosen citation style. We appreciate your positive remarks regarding the clarity, organization, and significance of our study. Your feedback on the detailed methods section and the thorough discussion has been particularly valuable.

I hope the revised manuscript will now meet the reviewers’ approval.
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