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Reviewer’s report:

This paper is generally well written and presented with only minor grammatical and punctuation errors, outlined below. It addresses an important and contemporary health care issue, that of facilitating and improving patient self-management of long term conditions. Although the study is specific to self-management following stroke and community-based nursing practice, the paper is very relevant to other long term conditions and health practitioners involved in rehabilitation. The authors have founded their study on both theoretical and empirical literature which is acknowledged. The title well defines the content of the paper and the abstract accurately summarises the methods, results and conclusions drawn. The methods are appropriate to the purpose of the study and are well described, allowing replication of the study with other patient cohorts to expand the body of knowledge. The interpretation of the findings and conclusions drawn are well supported by the data provided. Recommendations for further research are valid.

1. Major compulsory revisions - Nil

2. Minor essential revisions
   Numerous misplacement of apostrophes:
   section 1.2 line 16 should be stroke survivors' self-management...
   section 1.2 line 12 should be individuals' needs in a person-centred...
   section 1.3 line 29 should be towards individuals' personal self-management...
   section 6.1 line 4 (2nd para) should be nurses' practice...
   section 6.1 3rd para should be stakeholders'
   section 6.1 line 22 remove apostrophe from nurse's in "what nurses currently do"
   section 6.1 line 29 should be practitioners' training
   Figure/table legends line 6 Box 2 and line 8 Box 4 should be stroke survivors' perceptions
   Other errors"
   section 1.2 line 12 insert 'a' before person-centred manner
   section 4.2 1st para provide reference for systematic review ... (published separately)...


section 4.3.3 line 15 should be Focus group date were...
section 5.1.3 line 1 p15 insert 'in' before the process.
section 5.1.3 line 7 should be struggled to individualise self-management...
section 5.2.2 3rd line before Discussion remove "by' before as time consuming...
section 6.1 line 25 replace 'outwith' with ? outside
section 6.1 3rd paragraph insert 'be' before a less acceptable component...
Box 1 last cell should be data were
Boxes either difficult to read or illegible when printed

3. Discretionary revisions
Keywords: add patient activation
Add Study aim and design to Absract
Add an introduction before the background in body of paper to move forward the aims/purpose of the study
section 4.2.3 1st para include time period between first, second and third sessions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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