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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and useful piece of work that would be well worth publishing in the journal with a few amendments. What's there is good and solid. The topic is of international interest; the methods are solid; and the findings important, although mostly what one would expect.

What the paper is presently lacking is a broader contextual grounding. For publication in an international journal, with an international readership, what's really needed is much more linking to material outside of the study itself and Australia. There's a bit of reference to NZ (another country with similar sorts of issues facing indigenous people), but more of these sorts of references are needed. The IT material, for example, could be compared with experiences elsewhere. As it is, what's in the paper is nothing new. This should be stated and what to do about it drawn from lessons elsewhere. Same with other sections on, for instance, the role of the Board and political direction, on patient transport systems etc.

I recommend that the authors' deepen the contextual anchoring of material and arguments to the broader literature.

A few minor things
- p5 "mulit"?
- p8 state that interviews were transcribed.
- p10 it wasn't entirely clear how Kinyani translates into the five core themes. This could be better described.
- labels on interviewee quotes need to be individualised, perhaps with a number. Are there more than one (AHW, regional AMS). If so, show this.
- p14. The 'hidden agenda', did interviewees say what was driving this perception. Would be good to know.
- p19. Medicare and the rebate process will not be familiar for an international reader. Explain what this is, perhaps in footnote.
- p24 same with Div of GP
- p27 should be '40 leading non-government agencies'
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