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Editorial Office
BMC Journal of Public Health

Thanks for your consideration on our manuscript MS: 1761509584978733, Perception of Masculinity among Malaysian Young Men: a qualitative study of university students.

I would like to submit the revised version according to the reviewers’ comments. In response to the reviewers’ comments, the article has been altered as below:

Response to Reviewer 1: Dr Seng Fah Tong

1- The introduction section was changed according to the reviewers’ comments, especially according to the comments of the second reviewer who suggested different style to justify the importance of the study.

2- Methods: This study did not adopt Grounded theory as the research method. Thematic analysis method was used to analyze the data. Using the term “grounded theory” made a misunderstanding for reviewers, as we mentioned a part of grounded theory was used, which referred to designing a hierarchical model for thematic categories that happens in the qualitative research. In the revised version we corrected the terminology and did not mention the grounded theory method.

Participants selection procedure, sampling criteria, data collection place, analysis and issues of rigor have been explained in the revised version (page 7, line 13-22; page 8, line 1-13; page 9, line 4-23 and page 10, line 1-6).

3- The structure of the Results section was totally changed as both of the reviews had found it confusing. We changed the classification of the thematic categories and the terminology of the emerged themes. Consistency of the terms was considered. All the confusing terms were corrected according to new classification of themes.

4- The theme “Muscular man” was changed to “having a good body shape,” and the mentioned quote was deleted from the results section (page 10, line 19-21 and page 1, line 1-20).
5- The suggested theme “changing picture from muscular man to aesthetic body” was considered in the relevant section (page 11, line 19-20)

6- Conclusions section was changed according to suit the new thematic classification.

Thanks to the reviewer for the knowledgeable comments

Response to Reviewer 2: Dr Chirk Jenn Ng

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1- The research question was clarified in the revised version (page 5, line16-17). The title, objectives, results and discussion were amended in order to focus on the research question. The term “health related behaviors” was omitted from the title, results and discussion sections.

2- The introduction section was rewritten according to the reviewer’s suggestion, the importance of the masculinity, definitions, differences in perceptions of young and older men and masculinity in Malaysian setting were considered (page 3-5).

3- In the Method section, we provided the needed details: participants selection, inclusion and exclusion criteria, context/setting, who conducted the interviews, language issues, and interview protocol, analysis method and trustworthiness (page 7, line 12-22; page 8, line 1-21; page 9, line 4-23; page 10, line 1-6 ). Conceptual framework was mentioned in the “theoretical basis of the study” (page 7, line 1-2).

4- This study did not adopt Grounded theory as the research method. Thematic analysis method was used to analyze the data. Using the term “grounded theory” made a misunderstanding for reviewers, as we mentioned a part of grounded theory was used, which referred to designing a hierarchical model for thematic categories that happens in the qualitative research. In the revised version we corrected the terminology and did not mention the grounded theory method. The structure of the Results section was totally changed as both of the reviewers had found it confusing (page 10-14). We changed the classification of the thematic categories and the terminology of the emerged themes. Consistency of the terms was considered. All the confusing terms were corrected according to new classification of the themes. The results section was rewritten while more focused on the research objective. The theme “being (becoming) family man” was considered as understanding of future positions and roles.
“Gentleman” and “gentle man” as mentioned were considered as two different themes, both under the theme “having success with women”. “Religion” was considered as contextual factor affecting men’s conceptualization of masculinity and discussed in the discussion section.

5- Discussion section was totally rewritten with more focus on the research findings. Generalizations and judgmental conclusions were omitted from the discussion section. The discussion section was written according to the finding among university men, so the university context was focused in discussing the findings (page 14-16).

6- The conclusion section was totally changed and rewritten according to the findings and discussed data (page 16).

**Minor Essential Revisions**

1- The manuscript was edited by an English editor.
2- The title was altered according to the research question.
3- The sampling method was clarified in the methods section (page 7, line 20-22).
4- Cultural diversity was defined in the methods section (page 8, line 1-3).
5- The reason for choosing university students was explained in the introduction section (page 4, line 11-18).
6- The concept of “muscular” and “feminine” men was distinguished and defined under the theme “having a good body shape” (page 10, line 19-21; page 11, line 4-7)
7- More recent references were included in the literature (reference numbers: 4,11,13, 28,29,34,38,41,42,44,49)

**Thanks to the reviewer for the knowledgeable comments**

Sincerely,
Zahra Fazli Khalaf
University of Malaya