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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The authors note that it is difficult for Aboriginal community service providers to design evidence-based health programs/services/evaluation plans as they often do not have access to the literature, have knowledge of implementation science, among other issues. Thus, 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, beginning as early as the late 1990s (for example, see O'Neil, Reader and Leader 1998: http://sfaa.metapress.com/content/b7628vwvg7q127m8/). More recently, Ball & Pence (2011) have published a book about this subject called Supporting Indigenous Children’s Development: Community-University Partnerships, and many journal articles have been published on the subject. 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.

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.

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.

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.
5. Editing for clarity and conciseness across the paper is recommended.
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