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Dear Editor,

Please find attached a revised copy of our manuscript for submission to BMC Public Health in response to the review comments by the handling Associate Editor. The manuscript “Integrating Aboriginal community and research expertise to tailor a response to youth binge drinking: A grounded theory study” is based on original primary research in a discrete Aboriginal Australian community. It is based on one empirical case and provides a new theoretical model for integrating scientific and local community knowledges to develop an effective intervention for reducing youth binge drinking. As well as describing the impact of the binge drinking harm reduction project in the community, the key elements of the theoretical model provide a useful blueprint to inform the design and implementation of other whole-of-community projects, programs or services on a case by case basis.

Our responses to the handling Associate Editor’s points are:

1. Missing an Abstract

At the time of original manuscript submission, we uploaded an abstract into http://www.biomedcentral.com/manuscript/login/man.asp?txt_nav=man&txt_man_id=2126571975990039. This appears on my version of the online system; however, given that the Associate Editor was unable to detect the abstract, it has been revised and reloaded.

2. The overall structure of the paper is somewhat unclear

The structure of the paper has been revised according to the BMC Public Health guidelines to authors. It now comprises a background and methods, followed by results and discussion, limitations, and conclusions. A section on limitations has been included.

3. The objective is stated as proposing a theoretical model based on the work undertaken, however, the model seems to be presented too early (with a figure heading that does not reflect this as a new model), with the body of work undertaken instead reported after the model (consultation, getting the message out” phases) and not clearly tied back to the model.

The objective of the paper is to propose a theoretical model. We provide the model early in the results section as a framework for presenting the verifying qualitative grounded data from project partners.
which was analysed to construct the model. We have amended the figure heading to indicate that this is a new model. We have also added a sentence at the start of each of the stages of the model to more clearly tie the results back to the model.

4. Specific method details are missing

Sub headings have been introduced into the methods section (which describes the study design, setting, intervention, participants and data collection, and data analysis) to more clearly delineate the components and processes of the community based participatory research (CBPR) and grounded theory methods used. We have incorporated more detail of the methods, including the number and characteristics of participants and the steps of the CBPR and grounded theory methods.

5. The conclusions then start with the survey results which are stated to be part of a complementary paper under review and therefore should not be the conclusions of this one.

The conclusion has been reframed to refer to the processes reported in this paper. We have included a table which summarises the challenges and benefits associated with the efforts by research partnerships to tailor community responses. We deleted the discussion of mentoring as an approach for youth engagement.

6. More clearly state the aims/objectives of this paper (including in an Abstract and then in Introduction)

The objective of this paper is now clearly articulated in the abstract and introduction. The objective is to provide a theoretical model of how a research partnership integrated Aboriginal and scientific knowledges to tailor a whole-of-community project.
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We appreciate your consideration of our manuscript.

Yours sincerely,
Janya McCalman
Senior Research Officer
The Cairns Institute, James Cook University