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Comments

This interesting and well written manuscript which deals with a topic less studied. It provides valuable insights and has some interesting perspectives to add. However, it has some aspects that have to be addressed before I can recommend it to be accepted. My recommendation is therefore that the manuscript needs to make some revisions.

Below are some questions that I have and issues I think you should address;

1. The aim at page 3-4 and the aim in the abstract differs somewhat from each other.
2. You include a power calculation (page 5) but do not state what power (80%) you have calculated with, neither do you state what standard deviation you have calculated with.
3. You have a high degree of drop-outs, however, I cannot find any methodological discussion concerning this problem - please elaborate.
5. At page 6, line 18-19 you write "18 items that measured what might have been the cause of T2D." Please insert "…the respondents opinion of what might…"
7. The description of the psychometrics properties of the instruments is, in my eyes, a little inadequate. At page 9, line 10-11, you write that both instruments met requirements for
internal consistency but only present one alpha value. You do not present if this was on total score or subscale-level - please elaborate.

8. At page 9, line 13-15, you state that test-retest reliability was satisfactory. However, you present low correlation coefficients with a p-value below 0.05 (see also Table 1). The retest was done after two weeks (page 7, line 19), do you mean that the instruments are stable over time? Please elaborate.

9. It would be a help for the reader if you in your result section also inserted degree of freedom (df) in your presentation of χ2 and p-value.

10. At page 10, line 12 (one example), you present the mean number of number of symptoms. Why mean and not median and quartiles?

11. At page 10, line 19, you write that women perceived MORE negative symptoms. This is probably not right - as I see it, it has to be "to a higher degree"

12. At page 11, line 2-4, you present differences between the genders, however, I lack p-values.

13. At page 11, line 17-18 you state that the instruments showed acceptable reliability - please see comment 8

14. At page 11, line 19 you state that women "more often" perceived negative consequences. I believe it should state "to a higher degree".

15. At page 12, line 7-8, you state that men experienced fewer diabetes complications - I believe that it should state "assessed to a lower degree" since it is a score and to number of complications

16. I am lacking a section concerning Clinical implications from your study. Please elaborate.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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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