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Reviewer's report:

Background:

Line 107: A brief definition of the term "diabesity" should be provided.

Line 108: Since no systematic review of the literature has yet to be conducted, how do the authors reach the conclusion that these interventions need to be culturally relevant and incorporate traditional knowledge to be successful? This is more likely to be an hypothesis or question to be answered by the review.

Study Selection and Eligibility Criteria:

Line 174: Please provide an example of the typical intervention components common to traditional knowledge vs. lifestyle programs as well as the intervention components that would differentiate one type of program from another. Also, please explain how the reviewers will classify studies that test interventions that combine components of both types of interventions.

Discussion:

Line 243: The abbreviation T2DM could be used here since it has been introduced earlier in the manuscript.

Line 248: Please revise. The text currently reads, "If no interventions are identified to address the two diseases, then the situation requires urgent investment...". Why would one embark on a systematic review if a priori the authors suspect there will not be a sufficient number of eligible studies to review? Let us assume there are sufficient studies to justify conducting a systematic review. If that is the case, this sentence could be revised to address the review's hypothesis or central question, "If it is found that traditional knowledge interventions are more successful at preventing obesity and/or diabetes, urgent investment in the development, dissemination, and implementation of these interventions is warranted" or something to this effect. However, if the authors already suspect there will be insufficient studies to review given the parameters of their
inclusion criteria, could they consider expanding their criteria to include studies of Indigenous people outside of Canada and then extrapolate findings to this more specific population?
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