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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for letting me review this interesting paper. It is a systematic review of qualitative research on men’s experiences and perceptions towards self-management support for one or more long term conditions. The aim of this review was to determine whether self-management support interventions are acceptable and accessible to these men and explore facilitators and barriers.

Meta-Ethnography was chosen as approach.

Four domains were developed: 1) need for purpose; 2) trusted environments; 3) value of peers; and 4) becoming an expert.

The study is well-written and easy to read.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

Results

1. I would like to see a table (could be supplementary) which lists all third-order constructs (Domains) in one column, and important examples of second and first-order statements in the other columns so that the reader can follow the process of constructing the domains.

2. The four domains (need for purpose, trusted environment, value of peers and becoming an expert) seem convincing (a table as noted above would be helpful), but they are presented in the results part together mixed up with interpretation that belongs in the discussion.

E.g. in the results part, – first paragraph - “need for purpose” the male need for purpose is contrasted with the female preference for shared experience from the literature, second para: compared to “feminine” activities like “touchy-feely discussion”. Please distinguish more carefully between you own findings, present them succinctly and discuss them in relation to findings in the literature in the discussion section. Please go through the whole results section.

Conclusions:

3. The conclusions do not match your findings, please stay closer to your Domains.

4. Haven’t you generated hypotheses which require testing in further trials?
- Discretionary Revisions
- I wonder whether the type of LTC plays a role, and whether you might want to stratify your findings according to diseases of the male gender (cancer types) and mixed-gender diseases which also affect women. Maybe you have already looked at this!
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