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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for this opportunity. I find this submission to be a good qualitative research manuscript. Of the many positive points for me is the study participants, which are male.

There is one item of concern, to be considered a major compulsory revision, I would note. In the Methods section, sub-section Analysis, I suggest a providing succinct (1 or 2 sentences in length) definition of hermeneutical interpretation and its reference. The citation used in the manuscript is about learning how to conduct qualitative interviews (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

It would be nice, too, in the Method section, sub-section Ethics, a reference about the healthcare informatics system and its security & procedures as provided by the IT Department, The North Denmark Region.

Otherwise the other suggested revisions are to be considered discretionary in nature. I do understand English is a second language for the authors. In general a passive writing style is used (an example is the use of the word 'that' in a sentence). The preference is for a more active tense instead. For instance, in the Abstract, sub-section Results, the second and third sentences may require re-writing as follows: "Web 2.0 technologies allow for flexible and dialogue-based contact between not only patients and health professionals but also between just the patients. The opportunity to contact healthcare professionals is especially of great value."

The paragraphs throughout the article need to be designated by indenting the first line of each paragraph or leave a blank line between the paragraphs. It is difficult to read in its current state.

Again, thank you for this opportunity.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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