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**Reviewer’s report:**

Thank you for asking me to review the revised manuscript. The concerns that I had with the first draft have been largely addressed. The paper has been shortened and is much more focussed on the issues the research questions set out to answer.

It is important that negative results are published and the processes of implementation are understood in terms of how systems/approaches to care become embedded in clinical practice. Knowing and understand what doesn’t work in a particular context is just as important as knowing and understanding what does work. This is particularly important in the context of supporting patients to self-manage where large scale roll out of programs often report disappointing results and this is further reinforced by ambivalence towards self-management by health professionals.

I do not have any further comments to make.

**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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