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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to reviewer’s reports

Title: Paniya Voices: A Participatory Poverty and Health Assessment among a marginalised South Indian tribal population (version 3)

Dear Editor,

Thank you for this next series of reviews. In this paper, we re-organized the paper and re-drafted certain sections to better address the referee’s comments (we agreed with all of their comments). Further editing was also undertaken to improve clarity of the paper. We have tried to address the referee’s concerns as follows:

Responses:

Reviewer: M Chambers

1-2, 5: We have corrected the text according to the suggested editorial changes.

3: We have specified that consent was obtained with a signature. (page 9)

4: We have added a statement regarding the involvement of Paniyas in drafting ethical code in future studies (page 8).

6: Yes line 7 should have read cause effect and impact analysis, the text has been modified. (page 12)
7: Figures 2& 3 were identified in the text on page . (page 12)

8: We have added Figure 4 in the text. (page 13)

9: We have added further discussion of our findings. (page 13-14)

Reviewer: Nikki Clelland

A. Major compulsory revisions

1. We have revised the paper’s introduction to present more clearly our paper’s objective and the rationale for this (page 3-4).

2. We have separated the preliminary findings from the data recording, management and analysis. (pages 12-13) and we have added a proper conclusion. (page 14)

3. We have removed the statement ‘ultimately the success of Paniya Voices..’

B. Minor essential revisions

4. We have attempted to write clearer with less jargon and to provide further explanations and referencing of key terms in the paper, notably, for the statements regarding ‘PRAs’ (page 4) and what we meant by ‘proper research standards’ for training the NGO field team (page 10).

5. We have reworded the sentence ‘Further, our conventional health surveys based on responses..’ to provided more clarity. (page5 )

6. We have added Figure 4 in the text. (page 13)