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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

We appreciate the contributions of reviewers to improving the clarity and contribution of our manuscript, and thank you for the opportunity to respond to reviewers’ comments. Please find below a point-by-point response to the Editor and Reviewers’ concerns:

Editor

There seem to be dual objectives: to report on some findings and to propose a model. Currently the Background and objectives focus on the latter but the Methods and Results on the former. Please consider revising as per reviewer comments and consider approaching in terms of "primary objective" and "secondary objectives".

The primary objective of the paper is to propose a theoretical model of the process by which stakeholders involved in a research partnership designed and implemented an Aboriginal community response to alcohol harm. The findings are reported to justify the model and illustrate its application in this case. This has been clarified in the methods section of the paper.

Reviewer 1:

Major compulsory revisions

1. It was difficult to quickly ascertain the main stages of this Project and over what time period they occurred. A brief timeline/diagram needs to be included.

A timeline has been included in the Methods section.

2. The Results section needs to be separated into at least three or four clear components.

The subheadings in the results section pertain to the stages of the theoretical model and have been retained. However, we have sought to clarify the components of the results by providing clearer lead sentences for each subheading, reducing the length of the first section of the results and editing throughout.

3. A few quotations, while informative, are too long and need to be edited.
All quotes were reviewed and several were edited.

4. The Limitations section is rather cursory.

The limitations section has been expanded to acknowledge the limitations of the single case design and the constructivist grounded theory method.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

5. The word “data” is plural.

This oversight has been remedied.

6. A number of long sentences need to be broken up.

The paper was edited throughout and long sentences were broken up.

7. The Results section in the Abstract (p.2-3) is confusing

The results section in the abstract was rephrased.

8. The Methods section on the bottom of page 4 should start…

Rewritten as suggested by the reviewer.

9. Methods section, page 6, para 1: Rephrase:

This was rephrased as suggested by the reviewer.

10. Methods section, page 6, para 2: This statement/description needs references:

A reference was provided.

11. Methods section, page 7, para 2: Reword/simplify/break up this sentence:

The sentence was broken into two.

12. Methods section, page 7, para 2: Start a new paragraph here:

New paragraph inserted, as per reviewers suggestion.

13. Analysis section, page 8: Reword/simplify/break up this sentence:

The sentence was simplified.

14. This sentence on page 9, last para reframed.

The sentence was reframed as suggested by the reviewer.
Discretionary Revisions

15. Do all the components of Table 1: Attributes of tailoring a community response by negotiating knowledges and meanings: challenges and benefits directly and demonstrably flow from this particular study and analysis? The material presented in Table 1 is complex and could possibly form the basis of a separate article.

Both reviewers expressed concern about Table 1. We substituted a replacement Table 1 that provides in generic form the relevant points from the model in order to inform those wishing to apply the model to other situations.

Reviewer 2

Major compulsory revisions

1. It is argued that research partnerships are needed but there is little documentation on how to create research partnerships effectively. However, a growing body of literature on this subject does exist. Discussing some of the literature published in this area to date, and highlighting how this study and its findings adds to the conversation and/or builds on what we already know would be a useful addition to the paper.

The argument of the paper is not about how to create research partnerships, but rather about the pragmatic steps by which research partners collaborate to design, implement and evaluate tailored community based projects. This point is clarified by retitling the manuscript and reframing the background, with references to the extant literature.

2. As described by the authors, the objective of this paper is to “provide a theoretical model of how a research partnership integrated Aboriginal and scientific knowledges to tailor a whole-of-community project.” I am unclear on what the 12 project steering committee members and 3 researchers were asked regarding this objective, and how this information was used to inform the development of the model. I would suggest removing detail pertaining to data collection that was not relevant to the specific objective of this paper. It is difficult to assess the results and the model derived from the results without additional detail on how the data were collected.

We added a sentence to elucidate what the project steering committee members and researchers were asked about the project objective. We incorporated an additional figure – a timeline (as suggested by Reviewer 1) which provides more detail about what data were collected and when. All of the information provided regarding data collection does pertain to the development of the theoretical model which is the objective of the paper.

3. On p. 17 the authors list a large set of results from the project that were not described in the results section, and are not relevant to the objective of this paper. I would suggest the removal of this information.

Table 1 was removed from the paper

4. The authors note, in the limitations section, that “the key elements of the theoretical model provide a useful blue print to inform the design and implementation of other whole-of community projects, programs or services on a case by case basis.” Discussing the framework more generally and how it might be applied in other contexts would lend credibility to this statement, and speak to the applicability of this model more generally in public health.

We enhanced the limitations section and incorporated a description of how the model might be applied in the conclusion to the paper.

5. Editing for clarity and conciseness across the paper is recommended.
The paper was edited throughout.

Thanks again for the opportunity to respond to reviewers comments,

Yours sincerely

Janya McCalman
On behalf of
Komla Tsey, Roxanne Bainbridge, Anthony Shakeshaft, Michele Singleton and Christopher Doran