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Tēnā koe Dr Pentti

We wish to thank the editors and reviewers of BMC Medical Research Methodology for their review of "Consolidated Criteria for strengthening reporting of health research involving Indigenous Peoples: The CONSIDER statement" (BMRM-D-19-00226)
The authors of this study appreciate the time that the editors and reviewers have taken to review the manuscript and provide recommendations. We believe the suggested changes have improved the content and clarity of the paper.

Please find below a point-by-point response to the reviewers. Please note that all changes in the manuscript have been tracked. We thank you again for your further consideration of the revised manuscript.

Ngā mihi

Tania Huria, on behalf of the authors

Hendrik van den Bussche (Reviewer 1): This is a fine piece of work: I was unable to find any aspect to criticize except perhaps for the following two points:

Comment 1:

You did not point out sharply in which form you expect researchers to report on the CONSIDER statement in a paper: in extenso on the 17 items or only briefly in the sense of "CONSIDER statement considered". In case you prefer a report in extenso, how to you feel about producing a shortened list?

Author Response

Thank you for your comments. The manuscript has now been adjusted and now reads:

(Pg 7 Ln 135) “CONSIDER is designed to enhance research practices with and involving Indigenous Peoples. It is anticipated that to strengthen research reporting, investigators should report whether or not each CONSIDER checklist item has been addressed during research design or conduct.”

Comment 2:

Your acronym is of course easy to remember but it has no relation at all with your topic. Did you tried to find one related to "research involving Indigenous Peoples"? I quickly found IndiPep, IndiRes and IndiPeRes. That of course are only examples

Author Response
Thank you for your suggestions, however we consider CONSIDER to be relevant to the topic of the guideline as the word denotes a prompt for the proposed work to be undertaken by researchers. As such there is no change in the manuscript.

Alipasha Meysamie (Reviewer 2)

Comment One:

The manuscript is well prepared but: There should be considered a criterion related to ethical considerations for justice, beneficence and confidentiality of data specifically in work with indigenous people.

Author Response

Thank you. We have reviewed the manuscript and believe that the terminology (human rights, ethical guidelines) does effectively reflect the reviewers point regarding justice and beneficence. We do agree with the reviewer regarding including “confidentiality of data” and the statement now reads:

(Pg 14 Ln 298) “Ethical considerations of the data gathered including confidentiality …”

Comment Two:

There should be a criterion related to the independence of researchers specifically for showing the fairness of assessment, analysis and interpretation without prejudice and other conflicts may be related.

Author Response

The purpose of CONSIDER is not to reproduce existing ethical guidelines, which include issues of conflict of interest, and other such issues as you raise. We have amended the manuscript to clearly state this. The manuscript now reads:

(Pg 7 Ln 139) “The CONSIDER statement is not intended to reproduce general ethical guidelines.”

Comment Three:

It should be clear in the guideline, these criteria should be used for which type of studies and how. for example, is it uniformly applicable for qualitative and quantitative studies? can it be applicable as the same in clinical trials as observational studies and or for systematic reviews as
an example of secondary studies? these topics should be discussed in the manuscript and placed in the guideline.

Author Response

We consider these guidelines to be useful, as stated in addressing research that includes Indigenous peoples. We are purposefully silent on methodological approach taken, and consider the guidelines applicable across the spectrum of research approaches. We have however taken the reviewers comments on board and have made it more explicit that CONSIDER can be applied to all forms of original health research. It now reads:

(Pg 7 Ln 129) “The scope of the CONSIDER statement is all forms of original health research, regardless of methodologies, that includes a substantial Indigenous component including research: conducted on Indigenous lands, in which Indigenous identity is a criterion for participation, that seeks Indigenous knowledge, in which identity or membership of an Indigenous community is used as a variable for data analysis, in which interpretation of data refers directly to Indigenous Peoples or research that is likely to affect the health of Indigenous Peoples”.