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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) Limitations, Paragraph 1
The authors have done well to identify several limitations of the study methods. However, they have not explicitly addressed some key limitations that may have influenced the findings (e.g. sample bias - females already active, failure to recruit local researchers (Yapa), conducting interviews in 3rd or 4th language etc...). Most importantly, the authors have also failed to describe how the limitations that they have described may influence the study findings. It is important that obvious limitations and their implications on the results are described.

Minor Essential Revisions

1) Study population and study sites, paragraph 1
The authors refer to "a number of remote NT communities". If the authors know how many communities were consulted it should be reported here (even if it is explicitly stated as an approximation).

2) Study population and study sites, paragraph 1
What is meant by "the communities expressed a need for the study"? Was it the communities that "expressed" a need? If so, how? Or was it the researchers who assessed that there was a need? This needs to be clarified.

3) Study population and study sites, paragraph 1
The failure to recruit Yapa co-researchers is important and may have implications on the study findings (see comment on "limitations" above). It would be helpful for the reader to know why the recruitment was unsuccessful - this may be an important finding in itself.

4) Data Collection and Analysis, Paragraph 1
The authors should state more clearly what they were looking for in the "purposive" recruitment and how this was implemented.

5) Data Collection and Analysis, Paragraph 2
A description of what the first author observed and recorded is necessary. Were
these observations of the interviews? Of the paintings? Of the communities? Of physical activity? This needs to be clarified.

6) Data Collection and Analysis, Paragraph 3
When and how were "the interpretation and findings... confirmed by the co-researchers and participants as accurate, relevant and meaningful"? This needs to be clarified.

7) Results, Paragraph 1
What does "m=9" mean? This needs to be clarified.

8) All headings
The authors should be consistent in the capitalization used in all headings / sub-headings

9) References in text
There are several references in the text that do not have a close ")". This should be corrected before publication.

Discretionary Revisions
1) Background, Paragraph 2
The authors use the acronym NT for the first time in the main text (i.e. not in the abstract). I recommend that the authors consider articulating Northern Territory (NT) at this point in the text.

2) Setting the scene: some observations, Paragraph 1
The authors use the word "even" 3 times in the first two sentences. This reads a little "clunky" and may benefit from being rephrased.

3) Discussion, Paragraph 1
The first sentence of the discussion is very long and the reader is easily lost. I recommend breaking this in to two or three sentences to ensure your point is clear and easy to digest.
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