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Reviewers report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Not sure - key details are missing from the manuscript

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Not sure - I am not able to assess the statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors provide a strong rationale for understanding the beliefs of health care professionals in implementing self-managed care - an area of study that has not received much attention. They use a mixed method approach to address the topic. These are all strengths of this project.

What is less successful is the implementation of the research. The study is likely underpowered and there are issues in recruitment strategies; however, the authors themselves clearly discuss these issues in their limitations section.

The additional issue that I would add to the review of this paper is potential confusion between the importance of the beliefs of actual service providers and the beliefs of management or administrative staff. The authors do mention differences between these groups in passing but the analysis appears to group these groups together. Following their logic, the impact of those working with individuals with long term conditions and those responsible for setting policy could be quite significant. It would be interesting to explore the impact of these two groups in greater detail.

That said, this is an interesting article that starts to look at the impact of an important group in terms of implementing self managed care.

On a more practical note, this paper needs to be edited and the use of abbreviations (SSM, TPB, HBM, LTC in one sentence in the conclusion) makes the article difficult to follow at times.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Eligible HSV staff members were "identified by the SSM project manager" Where any guidelines offered to the project manager in terms of who to identify? Similarly, sic eligible staff members "volunteered to participate". Who was offered the opportunity to volunteer?

How was the TPB coding manual developed? Who was involved in developing it?
Is it appropriate to infer belief strength from utterance frequency?

Composite variable scores were calculated in accordance with "Frances et al procedure". This procedure is unknown to me and is referenced in a report to University of Newcastle (ie not publicly available easily)

Discussion of the scaling of individual items is not clear (1-7, +/- 3) is unclear (and again references Francis)

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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