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Reviewer's report:

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity of this paper on self-management support interventions for men with long term conditions. Overall, the paper is well written and makes a good point of explaining its intention as well as the need for such a review. Similarly, the method's section is very well described. However, there are several issues that I would like to see the authors address. First and most importantly is a more precise definition of self management support interventions in the introduction with examples. See below for more detailed recommendations and comments.

Major Compulsary Revisions:

1. on page 5 line 116, I would appreciate a concrete example of SMS services as well as of its positive effects on long term conditions.

2. Overall, the concept of SMS as well as the broad brush used in this review on LTC and the concept of "men" is a little irritating. The authors discuss this in the strength and limitations section at the end of the paper, however, I would like to see some of that discussion already in the introduction.

3. Results/Discussion:

   there seem to be several themes in the discussion that are not as clearly stated in the results. These are on page 17, lines 492-496 as well as lines 504 where is stated "our synthesis places this "disruption" in the context of men's gender identity". In many ways what is stated here is the importance of illness experience, however, the result's section does not focus on illness experience but on SMS and describes it as if it were independent of illness and its experience. The authors discuss this themselves on page 17 lines 510-513. However, I am not sure if the result’s should be rewritten to include this crucial aspect of experiencing an illness (and a diverse set of illnesses).

Minor essential revisions:

1. on page 4 line 107/108 add citations.

Discretionary revisions:

The tables are very difficult to read. While I understand that it is difficult to make them more readable, it may be worthwhile to think of means to simplify them.
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