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Abstract

(1) States that methods used were PRISMA reporting guidelines for systematic reviews. Would argue that PRISMA is not a methodology so this language needs clarified.

Background

(1) It is stated that the methods for developing the CAT framework are detailed elsewhere. However, given that this provides the framework for the analysis, it would be helpful to have some more detail on what actually constitutes the framework's domains. I'm assuming that it simply contains a list of priority areas from CATs and a list of principles from the NATSIHP but this is not clear.

(2) It is stated that this review is the second stage of a four stage project. However, only stages one and two are described here.

Methods

(1) It is not stated why a review of reviews was conducted, as opposed to a review of primary studies.

(2) The review protocol is available from authors. However, it is not clear if this was available in the public domain prior to the review being conducted. If it was not available publicly, there is no guarantee that any post-hoc amendments were made not made.

(3) It is not clear from the wording whether reviews of disadvantaged groups which may have included indigenous people in some studies/reviews were included.

(4) It is not stated here that reviews which contain studies with indigenous people who are not from Australia, Canada, USA or New Zealand will be included.
(5) Morbidity is included as outcome but it is not stated how this is measured (e.g. is rates of smoking related illness?).

(6) Improvements in equality, partnership, engagement and cultural respect are included as outcomes. These are quite nebulous areas so some detail on how these are to be measured would be helpful.

(7) No social science databases (e.g. ASSIA, Social Science Citation Index) were searched and this may have potentially yielded additional studies. I would have also expected CINAHL to have been searched. It is stated that MEDLINE and PubMed were searched, however, as PubMed contains MEDLINE I'm not sure why both were searched.

(8) Was there a cut-off for number of Google Scholar results?

(9) Why the limit of 2000? And will reviews that report on studies published before 2000 be included.

(10) Data extraction - not clear if this was done at the review level or individual study level.

Results

(1) AMSTAR. Lines 38 - 40 on page 17. It seems as if the AMSTAR score has been used to create a grade for risk of bias (i.e. low, moderate, high), however, it is not clear how this was done and if this grading system was based on previous work. As AMSTAR assesses study quality, which does not necessarily equate to the risk of bias, I would question the use of this approach to specifically assess risk of bias. Risk of bias in systematic reviews would be more appropriately assessed using the ROBIS tool (http://www.bristol.ac.uk/social-community-medicine/projects/robis/).

(2) Line 37 on p21 lacks clarity.

(3) Page 22 is one long paragraph and difficult to follow. In particular:

a. Line 5-7 on p22 lacks clarity.

b. Line 22 on p.22 - was this an intervention?

(4) Page 32 line 44. Which reviews?

(5) NATSIHP principles. This section is quite long. Given the difficulty in drawing out the NATSIHP principles due to the level of detail reported in the reviews, it is difficult to say how much of this information can be conclusive so I'm not sure that all the information provided is necessary. It may be more appropriate and easier to follow if it was summarised as a table or illustration instead (e.g. an annotated version of table 3).
Discussion

(1) The authors (rightly) consider whether evidence from other populations is applicable to indigenous people. It would also be worth considering whether the evidence they identified is applicable to other vulnerable groups (e.g. Gypsy/Travellers, refugees).

(2) Detail on stages 3 and 4 of the project and how they relate to this review would be helpful.

General points

(1) In-text references are sometimes out of sequential order

(2) No page numbers provided for quotations
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