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Reviewer’s report:

In this study, Nexo et al. use discrete choice experiments to analyse the willingness to pay (WTP) of people with and without type 2 diabetes (T2D). They found that there was a WTP for initiatives to support co-workers with T2D, although participants with T2D had lower WTP than those without diabetes. The authors should be congratulated for collecting and analysing a relatively large sample of survey data. Overall, the manuscript is well written, and the study has a clear and interesting research question. The conclusions given are supported by the results.

I have the following comments:

1. My main concern is that the discussion is largely speculative. While the findings of the study are interesting and address an important question, they tell the reader little about participants motives for selecting a particular scenario. Specifically, one might be equally interested in the drivers of 'unwillingness' to pay. The WTP for a workplace accommodation likely reflects a complex dynamic of a multitude of factors, including psychological and socio-economic influences; the ability to predict WTP from baseline characteristics alone, seems limited. The explanations given in the discussion each seem plausible, but they remain conjecture since (based on Table 1) the survey does not appear to collect information on reasons for selecting a particular option. In my opinion, this is a major limitation that needs to be acknowledged and discussed.

2. In the methods (page 5 line 33), the authors state that participants were contacted from established web-based panels. This creates large potential for selection bias. While this is fully acknowledged within the limitations section, I suggest that the authors provide some context to these web-based panels (e.g. were the panels related to T2D). Such additional context would help indicate the likely impact of the selection on the study results, particularly when interpreting the results from the group of participants who are "representative of the general population".

3. Was the monthly pay reduction associated with each scenario designed to mimic real-world costs that would be representative of each attribute, or are these completely hypothetical? If hypothetical, how might this affect the results? Specifically, would different cost levels have given different results? I suggest adding a comment on this. It seems plausible that the magnitude of the cost will play an important role in a participant selecting a given scenario.
Minor comments:

1. What was the response rate of the call to participate in the online survey?

2. Can the authors provide additional details about the online survey that "was designed and developed in the spring of 2015 in Denmark" (page 5 line 28)? For example, could a screenshot be given (in a supplement) of the interface that users were presented with?

3. Results (pg. 8 line 8-10): "Excluded respondents reported that they responded even though they did not understand, were bored, or wanted to be done with the questionnaire". Do the authors have any explanations around why some participants indicated they were bored? Could the design of the survey have been altered to reduce the risk of this (albeit the proportion of such responses was relatively low)?

4. In table 2, why are there no responses to the "Relative or friend with diabetes" question within the T2D sample? I suggest the addition of a footnote to Table 2 that clarifies this.

5. The manuscript states that "Participants from the T2D sample were less educated, more likely to be working part time, and more likely to be working in the public sector (Table 2)" (pg. 8 line 21). However, there is no indication of significance of such differences given in the text or table 2 - what statistical test has been conducted here?

6. In table 3, there appear to be 6×9=54 hypothesis tests being performed across the 6 attributes and the 9 baseline characteristic variables; how was multiple testing handled?

7. The T2D sample is an interesting group to analyse since their WTP is essentially having a circular impact on their own workplace accommodation (as discussed by the authors on pg. 10/11); this group presents an interesting psychology. Is there an argument that people with T2D should not have to incur monthly pay reductions to implement workplace initiatives that are designed to help them (over and above paying their taxes)?

8. The acronym "WHO" on page 4 needs spelling out as "World Health Organisation".
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