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Reviewer's report:

This paper addresses the prerequisites for facilitating diabetes type 2 self-management on a so called 'meso-' or macro-level in six different countries. To measure these prerequisites 90 semi-structured interviews are held.

My main concern regards the many indistinctnesses in the paper.

1. Key variables are not well-defined, namely: what is considered self-management, what macro-, what meso-level? The lines 203-204 are a rough description; what is a trans-historical factor? If it is a government's policy to organise self-management at a local level (which might be quite reasonable), it seems to be classified as 'Reluctance / inability of policy makers to regulate processes and environments.' One could call this policy a shift from macro to meso level.

2. The relationship between the three themes mentioned in lines 231 - 234 and Table 2 is unclear. What do the authors mean with the variable 'Social environmental influences on diabetes self-management?' Who decided on the sub-themes?

3. The six participating countries are divided in two or three groups. Was this a specific research question? Spain is called a medium income country, in contrast to UK. On what basis? Some countries have well-established social democratic traditions (line 650). Who defines? The lines 652-655 are not a result, but a political interpretation.

Also the usage is not always clear, for example the following lines are difficult (or not) to understand: 91-93, 96-97, 99-100 (austerity measures? 'shaping illness management?'), 102-106, 206-208, 321-322, 338, 395-398, 574-5.

The Analysis is not very clearly described. 'Within interdependent systems': what does this mean? How were links analysed? Which software package was used? What does mean' through the cross-cultural analysis taken in the data clinics' (lines 220-221)?

Table 1: In 5 out of 6 countries most respondents belonged to the category 'other professionals, besides doctors and nurses'. More details are necessary.

Minor issues:
- abbreviations are used, but not clarified: CIM (360), SN (461), CDM (618)
- the Abstract should clearly state that the study regards type 2 diabetes self-management and clearly define it.
- line 212. Five countries?

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

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

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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