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Reviewer's report:

Overall, I feel like the article can be shortened, and there is room for improvements in how the theory and results are embedded. To my opinion, a short report should be sufficient for this study, instead of an article. I also think the authors can make their report more interesting by investigating differences in perceptions between subgroups, for instance between 1) patients with complications and without complications (if known), 2) patients with a long diabetes duration vs patients with a short illness duration, or 3) young onset vs old(er) onset of diabetes. If differences are present, one could identify specific patients populations for whom additional support or education by health care providers might be warranted.

Introduction

I think the authors should elaborate more on the importance of illness perceptions by describing something about the underlying theory and the known associations with outcomes in chronic conditions, such as type 2 diabetes. Furthermore, the authors could explain what current challenges in diabetes care may be improved by gaining more insight into the perceptions of Saudi patients with type 2 diabetes. The first paragraph can be shortened to 2-3 sentences (what is diabetes, and what are its effects on individuals and society/health care systems).

Methodology

As mentioned above, I would suggest subgroup analyses. Illness perceptions are known to change with disease progression (e.g. type of treatment, complications, etc.) and therefore, most likely, different across this very wide variety of patients that participated in your study. For instance, recently diagnosed patients without diabetes-related complications will probably perceive type 2 diabetes as less serious than patients who are experiencing diabetes-related complaints.

Results and discussion

The aim of the study was to examine the perceptions of Saudi T2DM patients, however, the majority of the results and discussion section describes the sociodemographic background and illness-related characteristics of the participants in the study, and its mutual associations. A short
description of the study sample should do. Mutual correlations between the sociodemographic and illness-related characteristics are, in my opinion, not of interest for this study. Tables should only provide the scores for the scales of the IPQ-R, not every question separately. Finally, like in the introduction, the discussion does not explain the link of the illness perceptions with health-related behaviours and outcomes. What are the implications for (further) research and clinic?

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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