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Reviewer’s report:

The authors addressed successfully the issues that were raised from the first review. The new revision adds more credibility to the study and the new additions in the discussion support the results adequately. A few last recommendations:

I think that since the issue with the response rate on the call was raised by both reviewers, it would be good to acknowledge this in the discussion or maybe in the sample characteristics section. You could say something regarding the non-availability of the data.

Some of the strengths of the study are not mentioned in the manuscript and they could be mentioned. The questionnaire was short and comprehensible. In my opinion, this is indicated by the very low number of unreliable responses. Furthermore, you pre-assessed the questionnaire with individuals and then pilot-tested it in order to achieve a representative sample of those eligible, which is a plus of the study.

P.10 line22: I think a reference is needed for the statement "Laws and practices underpinning work accommodations are among the structural factors that may contextualize the findings."

Finally, I am wondering where your study stands when compared with other similar studies on work initiatives for people with T2D. Nowhere have you talked about comparisons with other studies (except for the frequent breaks during work initiative) so I am curious as to what has been done before. Are your results similar to those from other studies? Or is this the first study that looks at work initiatives for people with T2D? I didn't see that 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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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