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Executive Editor
Natalie Pafitis
BioMed Central

Dear Executive Editor

Re: From targets to ripples: Tracing the process of developing a community capacity building appraisal tool with remote Australian Indigenous communities to tackle food security

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the editorial requests. We have revised the manuscript as a result of these requests. Please find our response to these requests below:

1. Consent

Please add a formal consent to participate statement to the manuscript, explicitly stating whether consent was verbal or written.

We have modified the ethics statement to:

“Ethics approval for all aspects of the GFS Project was attained from the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) of the Northern Territory Department of Health and Menzies School of Health Research (ref. HREC 09/07), Cairns and Hinterland Health Service District Ethics Committee (ref. HREC/10/QCH/71-678) and the Central Australian HREC (ref 2009.02.02). Signed partnership agreements were negotiated with participating organisations and communities”.

2. RATS guidelines for qualitative research

Please ensure that the qualitative component of your study adheres to the RATS guidelines for reporting qualitative studies and add a statement to that effect in the Methods section.

We have very carefully reviewed the RATS guidelines in relation to the study we have reported in this manuscript.

We have added the following paragraph to our methods section to reflect application of these guidelines:

“Although here we are documenting a tool development process with community participants rather than a straightforward qualitative study involving community, we in the research team have endeavoured to adhere to the RATS guidelines where applicable in clearly documenting the relevance of the study questions, the appropriateness of the method employed, the transparency of procedures undertaken and the soundness of our interpretive approach”. 
We have modified the opening sentence of the study design section in the methods and the title of the manuscript to make clear to the reader that we do not use conventional qualitative research techniques like interviews or participant observations but rather describe a process outline for tool development. Our opening paragraph of the method states our down-to-earth procedures that are not specifically qualitative research-oriented. Further our findings are not grounded in a theoretical or conceptual framework but are aiming to form the basis of initiating a conceptual model.

3. Sections and section headings

We have modified the headings throughout the manuscript to comply with the format required for the article and have separated the methods and results.

Thank you for this opportunity to respond and make modifications to the manuscript. We hope it meets your approval.

Yours sincerely,

Julie Brimblecombe, PhD
Senior Research Fellow