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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Not sure - key details are missing from the manuscript

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

N/A - no experiments or analyses

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: This article is more like a narrative and a review than a systematic inquiry that defines research.

Their review of available literature is quite impressive; the attempt to describe a research approach in the method of participatory collaboration of researchers and indigenous people is encouraging, but there should be a systematic approach to participant selection, which was well-described in the methods.

Their description of the methods needs to be more specific: How were the researchers selected to be part of the study group? How many were involved? What method was applied in selecting the people interviewed? What guided the discussion? How were the data extracted and analysed?

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Objective: The research aim should be clearly stated.

Methods: Pages 7 & 8, lines 256-273: The statements seem to fit more into background information and study justification than in the methods.

Methods: You may want to define what yarning circle means and provide the reference and state how you identified and selected the yarning circle you engaged. How many were there and what was their composition and characteristics? How was the discussion or interview conducted? State any guiding principles. How were the response and comments documented? How was the information or data obtained, extracted, and analysed?

It may be better to separate the results and discussion sections or properly label the section 'Results and Discussion'.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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