

Peer Review

Review of: "EYpA: Cultural Integration and Adaptation of the Honest, Open, Proud Program for Use in People with Multiple Sclerosis in Greece"

Thomas Klein¹

1. Universität Ulm, Germany

Dear authors,

In your paper "EYpA: Cultural Integration and Adaptation of the Honest, Open, Proud Program for Use in People with Multiple Sclerosis in Greece," you adapted the Honest Open Proud program for multiple sclerosis patients in Greece and showed how the participants of the program interacted with it. Although this adaptation of HOP is very interesting and the manuscript is well-written, I want to address some points from whose revision the manuscript will benefit, in my opinion. You will find my comments below:

On page 4, you write the sentence: "Corrigan and Lundin aimed to eliminate stigma due to mental illness,...", which is redundant. Therefore, you should change the formulation.

On page 6, you wrote that the adaptation of the HOP program included "Greek-specific terminology." I think a short example would be helpful for readers to get an understanding of to what extent adaptation to a Greek setting means translation or a local terminology.

Also, on page 6, you explain that HOP sessions were conducted in online meetings. To my knowledge, the form of presentation (in-person vs. online) has a huge impact on many aspects of the session, such as atmosphere, group dynamics, and focus on the program. What is your experience with it? I think this circumstance should at least be mentioned in one sentence in the limitation section.

I think the results section falls short of having a comprehensible structure. I think it would benefit from more subheadlines along the main themes identified through qualitative analysis that are reflected in the presented quotes, e.g., "Participants' plans on how to tell their story."

In general, I would like you to extend the description of the results of the adaptation, if possible. I do not feel that I received a good overview of your changes from the classic HOP version. Maybe it would already be helpful to explain in more detail what the deviations from the original program are and why you decided to apply these deviations. Additionally, if possible, I can also recommend you extend your interesting results section. I assume you have many results to present.

I hope these comments will be helpful in thinking about changes to your manuscript.

Thank you for your research, and best regards,

Your reviewer

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.