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Reviewer’s report:

I think this is an excellent paper which tackles data which is difficult to analyse, organise and present into a coherent narrative and the authors have done this well. I have no hesitation in recommending this paper for publication. In reading the paper I was curious about a couple of issues and I think some examples would enhance this paper. These are listed below:

1. Pg 6 Starting line 26 the authors state "we purposively focused on diabetes and Parkinson's disease as two (clusters of) long-term conditions that between them, by virtue of their contrasts, could help illuminate the diverse considerations salient for more general discussions about SSM." It would be useful if the authors could give at least one example of the differences.

2. Pg 6 Line 42 - what publicly information was used to sample professionals?

3. Pg 7 line 33 - The authors state "Particular care was taken to frame questions about "success" in ways that would elicit the professionals' own personal constructs, and avoid (in so far as was possible) imposing particular ways of thinking about 'quality' or 'outcomes'." An example would be useful.

4. Pg 8 line 14 - the authors state philosophical theories were used to inform their thinking. I think it would be useful to have a description of which theories and how they were used.

5. In the discussion there is almost no comparison with other literature. I am curious as to whether this work is unique? Are there no comparisons with findings from the critical interpretative synthesis which underpins this work?
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