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Reviewer’s report:

This article is clearly written and discusses an innovative consensus event and related research involving young adults with type 1 diabetes. I think it will be of great interest to readers of the journal. I have a few minor comments and suggestions.

On page 6 there is a paragraph discussing discrete choice experiment (DCE) methodology that I am sure readers would be interested to know more about, so I suggest 1-2 references about this methodology are provided.

On page 6 a qualitative engagement study is discussed, but again not referenced for the reader to learn more.

On pages 9-11 different roles are discussed to provide support for young people with type 1 diabetes - 'named supporter', 'youth worker' and 'key worker'. Can the authors say a little more about what these roles would entail and how they are different from each other?

On page 15, second paragraph, there is a rather brief discussion of new and challenges to the research team from the approach adopted. Can more be said here, such as lessons to be learned, how they might have done things differently, things that went well etc. This will be of particular interest to research teams interested in adopting a similar process in their research.

Page 5, line 48, reference 9 - I don't think this is the correct reference, should it be 6?

Plain English Summary - typo line 18, policy makers (not markers)
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