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Reviewer’s report:

This is an original study which looks at preferences for co-workers of people with type 2 diabetes and the preferences of people with type 2 diabetes for people who have diabetes. The methods described in the manuscript are sound and the conclusions drawn from the results explain adequately some of the preferences that are implemented in the workplace in Denmark for people with type 2 diabetes. Some recommendations are listed below.

Major:

What about the generalisation of your study? Do you think that your results can be applied to other countries also? Or do you think that your results may be limited only in a Danish setting?

Page 6, line 11: This is not convincing at all. I am worried about the construction of the questionnaire and whether it could be considered reliable. I am wondering how were the discrete choice questions developed? Were there people with T2D involved in the development of the questionnaire? Were the questions discussed with clinical experts? Was there a literature research on the important elements of patients with T2S in the workplace? Were the questions piloted first to assess their validity and then subsequently given to the study participants? In my opinion these are all important elements of developing a discrete choice questionnaire and the reliability of it, should be assessed extensively. These questions may cover some aspects of workers willingness to pay for flexible work conditions but do they truly represent important adjustments for people with T2D at the workplace?

Page 8, line 13: I am also worried that the sample may not be representative of the T2D diabetes sample. Web panelists alone who were identified as having T2D only may not very representative. You mention this in the limitations but have you considered using other datasets such as the steno diabetes center dataset (or other similar datasets) to validate your results?

Minor:

Page 5, line 30: I think a flow diagram displaying the study population is needed to make it clear to your readers what the 3 samples are and how many patients were excluded. I think this would help the readability of your manuscript.
Page 5, line 33: I am not sure if you have the information but it would be good to know whether the individuals included in the sample, were treated in primary care, hospitals or both. Also when did the data collection occur?

Page 5, line 42: I understand that the use of the question "Has a physician or other healthcare professional ever told you that you had diabetes?" in order to identify people with diabetes has been used in the literature but what have you thought of using more objective measures, such as the haemoglobin test for diabetes, to identify people with diabetes in your web panel sample? This would probably constitute a more reliable way to identify people with diabetes.

Page 6, line 8: What information did you have on health status? Please specify.

Page 6, line 13: What do you mean by "each hypothetical question could be combined in many ways"? Please explain

Page 8, line 16: It would be good to mention the size of the final sample in the manuscript as well.

Page 8, line 23: What about BMI and haemoglobin (HbA1c) tests? These two are two of the stronger predictors of diabetes and there is no information on them in the sample.

Page 8, line 23: Please report the participation rate as not all of the respondents answered the discrete choice questions.

Page 8, line 42: Table 3 is included but only discussed very briefly. I would expect a bigger discussion on table 3. There are some interesting results in the table that should be highlighted.

Page 11, line 28: Another limitation is that your discrete choice experiments were not piloted before application. Scenario descriptions must be meaningful and interpreted unambiguously, and the sample must be representative of those eligible. Also some discussion on the characteristics of the patients that were excluded is required, and a discussion of why these patients did not understand or were not willing to answer the questions is needed.

Table 3: How was the severity of diabetes assessed? This is nowhere mentioned in the manuscript.

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

Yes

**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.

Yes

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.
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