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Reviewer's report:

Have young men been targeted to change risk behaviours? A scoping review of the literature.

1. The review is largely descriptive. However, given that the inclusion criteria for this scoping review is somewhat rigid - more emphasis on the quality of the evidence and synthesis of the field should be provided.

2. Please comment on why you have 17-35 to delineate “young men”. Is this the way that young men are defined within the epi literature, a demographic where a certain type of risk taking is most prevalent? Because you mentioned that 17 year olds are included because of risky driving behaviour you should comment further on the way that different risk behaviours are engaged over the life course i.e. are risk behaviours taken on by men in their early 20s different than those in their 30s?

3. There are a lot of references to sex differences in the background literature. I actually think this is a disservice to the issue at hand (men’s risk taking) and is discordant with the stated aim of the paper. Said another way you don’t promise or provide a gender or sex comparison – so the lead in is off track. I suggest an overhaul of the ROL to flesh out the epidemiology that underpins the need for targeted interventions – and the premise upon which your paper is submitted. An example relates to Page 5 reference 26 – where you claim men as MORE constrained than females. Please rethink this claim – and your Messner reference point in doing that.

4. P. 6-107- really, no suicide studies on young men?

5. The nod to precede-proceed is a cul-de-sac. It appears in the ROL and does not get mentioned again. I suggest you delete it or connect it to the discussion.

6. p. 7 – Participants were excluded if they were from low or low to middle income countries because of the “large heterogeneity between developed and undeveloped countries” presumes that there is no heterogeneity between income and cultural groups within developed countries. This should be stated in your limitations.

7. p. 12-13- Interventions done in developing nations were said to be excluded but Africa, Asia and South American were listed in the included interventions.
8. P.13 Line 269 – Is North America actually Canada here?

9. The conclusion is meek. Based on this review and your extensive reading you can afford to assert some recommendations. I would like to know if risk taking permeates multiple practices among young men? Can you say something about that – and the implications for interventions. Related to this – though risk taking is understood as a men’s issue might there be benefits in father-son or couple dyad intervention points?

10. You mention gender or masculinity early on. I wonder how the plurality of masculinities might feature in your discussion in book-ending the centrality of gender in the paper?

11. You might also more explicitly say something about the limitations of sex comparisons (assuming you clean up the ROL in the front end) – in guiding men-centred interventions.

12. I won’t belabour what else might have featured in your review – but suffice to say you have short changed Canada and some of your Australian counterparts – by their omission. You might want to 1. Take another look or 2. Soften the claims that there are entirely a lack of research evaluating interventions targeting behaviours in studies with young adult males.

13. The statement is made that more studies should adopt a theoretical framework – is this any theoretical framework or one tailored to the change model?

14. p. 19- Implication that internet may be a better, more cost effective alternative- no literature to back this up- weakly stated.

15. p. 18- “males and females are not homogenous with regards to health behaviours, beliefs, values and personalities”- unclear about meaning here. Is there is the assumption then that all males are homogeneous with respect to these factors.