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Reviewer's report:

Thank you to the authors for their clear explanation of the changes made. I just have a few comments on the new sections added, mostly related to the grammatical correctness!

P5 line 15 "seen as a mean to increase independence and enabling participation in the society" should be "seen as a means to increase independence and enable participation in society".

P6 line 5 "..not simultaneously with other training." This is repeated in next sentence

P6 line 12 "…ICT training has been a part of standard rehabilitative care for a longer time", This is poor English - it was better in its original version

P7 line 3 "…. the researchers provided assistance through telephone" Poor English. This was better in original version.

P8 line 19 "The D-AI measures rehabilitation needs of visually impaired persons and rehabilitation outcomes, hence is the vehicle towards possible improvement in well-being (ICECAP-O) and health-related quality of life (EQ-5D)." This is poorly written - it isn't the D-AI which is the vehicle, it is successfully addressing the needs which is likely to achieve the improvement.

Some more substantive issues:

P10, line 21 You say here that you have assumed that those who didn't complete the training didn't gain in QoL or wellbeing. I think it would be better to delete this statement, since you haven't included this zero improvement for 14 participants in your calculations, and this statement might give the impression that you had.
P18 line 4 The description of the Bray et al study is still incorrect!

P18 line17 It is not appropriate to compare the changes in the ICECAP(O) in this study with changes in a different instrument in another study to assess clinical relevance. There is no reason to assume that a change of 0.04 in one instrument is the same as 0.04 in a different instrument, even if both are measuring a function described as "well being". This comparison should be deleted.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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