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Dear Dr. Bigna,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide modifications to our paper based on comments made by the reviewers. We addressed final concerns noted by the reviewers and have responded to each below. As requested, we have included a clean copy of the manuscript rather than a track changes version. We thank you the reviewers for their time and look forward to the publication of the manuscript.

Manuscript PUBH-D-19-01195

Reviewer 1

A) Previous comment: Specify if a consecutive sampling was used.

Authors: We have specified in the methods that a convenience sample was used. See Data Collection section on page 5.
New comment: There is a difference between SAMPLING and SAMPLE. Sampling describes how the participants were recruited and sample states how many were recruited. Although it is important to report that you used convenience sample, authors should also state how they recruited the participants. Sampling method can include and mix: stratified sampling, random sampling, consecutive sampling….

We apologize for this confusion and have updated the Data Collection section to state consecutive sampling was used. Please see the first full paragraph on page 6.

B) "few individuals approached declined to participate". The exact number should be given.

Authors: We have added details into the methods to specify that less than 10% of those approached agreed to participate. See page 6.

New comment: "Less than 10%" is not an exact information. Authors should report the exact number and then add the proportion. For example, we approached XXX individuals, among which X (X.X%) declined to participate.

This has been corrected to provide exact numbers. Please see the first paragraph on page 7. In addition, we specified the response rate as exactly 92% in the results on page 9 rather than ‘around 90%’ to ensure exact information.

Reviewer 2

The authors answered the suggestions made from the peer review, contemplating the evaluative requirements of this journal. The results presented are relevant to Public Health, especially for the health of indigenous peoples. Thank you
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