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Reviewer’s report:

The revised work is much improved; however, methods and presentation of the results need extensive work to be accepted. I strongly suggest that they seek out statistical consultation on their analytical approach.

Major compulsory revisions:

If I read correctly, authors only had separate access to indigenous and non-indigenous people, not the total population as a whole. It is a pity that they could not run multinomial logistic regression analysis, taking non-indigenous group as a reference so that the effects can be compared directly.

At least authors could take relative risk ratios (dividing the comparing group of the OR by the reference group one) to show the magnitude of the effect in reference to the non-indigenous group in comparing the prevalence of VHPD.

Also, I suggest to analyze the indigenous people as whole, not stratified by remoteness, but stratified by sex so that the effects of SES difference on VHPD can be tested.

I totally disagree to test each SES measure on VHPD and to use non responses as a category (i.e. household income see tables 3 & 4).

Authors need to enter selected SES measures first, and then adjusted for demographic differences (i.e. age, marital status, education, housing tenures) between remote and non-remoteness. Authors use many SES measures and I suggest that they stick to few to avoid over-adjustment.

Figures:

Figure 1: If Authors want to show this, there is not much point to make an outcome with a cut off point (VHPD). Authors should treat the outcome as it is so that they will not lose detailed information. Figures 2 & 3. I believe authors did show this on the tables. If so, there is no need to repeat the same information.

Minor essential revisions:

Abstract:

Authors set the study outcomes as ‘very high psychological distress (VHPD)’. This has to be addressed in the background, not in the methods.
Also, authors did not measure for racism or marginalisation in their study. What they suggest in the conclusions is not evidence based. They only can suggest that future research is to be done in those areas.

List of abbreviations: If these are described in the text, there is no need for the list.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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