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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript is a clearly written description of an initial needs assessment for the development of men’s health topics in medical school curriculum, based in part on the efforts of a working group of several universities and agencies. The abstract conveys, in part, the content of the full manuscript. Although this preliminary work resulted in the development of modules for a curriculum, the present study does not include a specific focus on these core modules or their incorporation into medical schools. The questions asked of the informants were more generally about male health issues in curriculum. The logical flow of these ideas is somewhat confusing to the reader.

The issue of exploring attitudes towards a men’s health curriculum was clearly posed in the description of the interviews. This effort focused on an exploration of the issues perceived by faculty, no specific hypotheses were stated or needed.

The methods for collecting the information and the selection of subjects is clearly described, but there is little information about how the thematic analyses was conducted and the findings were identified.

As a preliminary investigation of the intention of the interviews, the data may be considered adequate. In a general sense, this manuscript represents a pilot on which a further and more inclusive investigation of the issues at other schools and held by other shareholders could be undertaken. The results here really cannot be considered as portraying a full picture that can be easily generalized beyond the limited respondents and schools interviewed.

Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? – Although the data are limited by the sample, a wide range of concerns seems to have been identified in the interviews and discussed in the manuscript. The inclusion of three paragraphs on the concept of a ‘community of practice’ seems to be a leap from limited data to a potential ‘solution’ to issues identified. While this might be a potential approach to the issues, it seems not well based in the specific findings of the study and somewhat extraneous to the study’s purpose.

Limitations of the study are not indicated.

Compulsory Revisions: The specific intention of this manuscript needs to be
clearly stated, and its content related to that intention. The mixing of additional issues about men’s health in the introduction as well as the potential ‘solutions’ in the discussion may be of interest, but are not immediately relevant to the content of the needs assessment. It is not immediately clear why the needs assessment was conducted AFTER the completion of the modules. The authors also need to better describe the process by which the coding and categorization of the interview content was completed, along with methods to insure the trustworthiness of the findings.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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