

## Review Manuscript 1004

### *Reviving Traditional Native American Food with Hunt. Fish. Gather. Program*

**1) Please review abstract and comment whether it provides a clear explanation of the manuscript.**

The Summary provided on the website serves as an abstract for the submitted article. The summary could be clearer if further methodological details were disclosed. For example, this study is an evaluation of an educational/awareness program of healthy eating for the prevention or intervention of non-communicable diseases (NCD) with a focus on traditional foods. However, the summary sets up an expectation that the study is an intervention with people living with NCDs. Perhaps changing the language from “This study examined outcomes ...” to “This study examines awareness outcomes of an educational program...” with (who participated) (N). In addition, there were no program participant requirements of living with or diagnosis of NCD.

**2) Please comment on each section (e.g., Introduction/background, Methods, Results, Discussion) and provide your thoughts.**

Introduction:

The introduction provides a broad view of healthy eating and positive health benefits of eating traditional foods. Overall it could use more revision to eliminate redundancy of the first three paragraphs.

*Traditional Native American Foods and Practices*

The first paragraph (first three sentences) of this section is informal communication and incongruent with the tone of the majority of the article.

*Benefits of Traditional Native American Food*

This section is repetitive with previous sections of the introduction and could be combined.

*Hunt. Fish. Gather*

This section reports as a community-based participatory research project. However, this is a student-led program process evaluation study. Therefore, it is unclear who fits the roles of “community” (population where the research occurs) and “academic partner” (researcher(s)). It seems that the community role is the food systems section of the university and the academic partner are the scholars conducting the research?

Methods:

*Participants*

There is no N (number of participants) reported. It is also unclear if the participants were the same through the different years and if the N is from both years from just one year.

*Survey & Procedure*

These sections are separated into subsections but overlap in reporting. You could combine them.

*Statistical Analysis*

This section is written somewhat rudimentary for an empirical journal. Was a power analysis done? How were data recoded from 5 or 4 Likert points to three points?

Results:

Directionality is missing (means and standard deviations). Magnitude is missing.

Discussion:

Overall nice discussion of limitations and recommendations for future research. Final editing could make the section more concise.

Conclusion:

Data does not support the statement made in the last sentence of first paragraph.

- 3) It is important to note the balance of the manuscript's research/science and its ability to speak to a variety of readers.**

This article, as written, speaks to providers, practitioners, or undergraduate students. It has the potential to speak to graduate school students and beyond with expert revisions.

- 4) You will also be asked to recommend whether this paper should be:**

**Encouraged to submit major revisions**

Accepted with minor revisions

Rejected without an option to resubmit