

Reviewer comments-2

1. The manuscript addresses an important topic. However, the justification for the manuscript and the unique/novel contribution it makes to the existing body of knowledge can be strengthened. The particular research gap has not been highlighted sufficiently and consequently the need for this particular contribution is not well argued. Moreover, the scientific rigour of the findings are compromised by the limited description of the methodology and measures taken to ensure trustworthiness of the findings. This is further exacerbated by a limited presentation of alternative evidence. The discussion is not critical enough as cautioned by Gregory et al.
2. The title can be re-worked to be more descriptive of the specific context/parameters of the study. Selected literature is too vague. Indicate that the study explored men's help-seeking behaviour in the context of medical and mental health problems. However, the study perimeters are not clearly defined and the authors are encouraged to specify the scope of the review and rework the title to reflect this.
3. No. The abstract does not indicate the gap the review aims to fill to justify the need and value this study adds to the existing body of knowledge. The method is not clear, three techniques are mentioned (knowledge synthesis, thematic analysis, and narrative review). My understanding from reading the paper is that a narrative review was conducted to synthesise existing knowledge into a more nuanced understanding of factors that impact men's help-seeking behaviour, while a thematic content analysis was utilised to meaningfully group information into themes. Men's views of their own masculinity was used as an analytical lens. The abstract does not clearly define the perimeters of this study or specify the particular target audience. Reworking the abstract to address these matters can strengthen it.