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Reviewer's report:

The authors are to be commended on a well-written and comprehensive systemic review protocol of interventions aimed at preventing diabetes and obesity within the Canadian indigenous populations. I have just a few comments:

1) It would be helpful to discuss the backgrounds of the reviewers and teams. Will there be balance across teams in terms of experience?

2) The authors research question refers to "traditional knowledge and lifestyle-based interventions"? There does not appear to be a definition of what constitutes a traditional versus non-traditional intervention. Since the authors only want to include traditional interventions, they should clearly define both what does and what does not constitute a traditional intervention.

3) With regards to secondary outcomes, if there are any studies looking at changes in insulin sensitivity or insulin resistance, the authors may wish to include these parameters as well since there interest is in diabetes prevention. (I'm assuming insulin and glucose levels refer to fasting insulin and glucose levels.)

4) The authors state that they are including cross-sectional studies in addition to others. I would not think cross-sectional studies would be useful in determining the effectiveness of an intervention, please comment.

5) The use of the term diabetes in the background (and nowhere else in the paper) is distracting. I would suggest the authors follow what they did in the rest of the paper and refer to diabetes and obesity unless they wish to carefully define the term.
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