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Reviewer's report:

This is an important study that adds new knowledge to the are of occupational therapy driving assessment. Some areas for improvement include;

- Page 4 paragraph 2 Justification for methodology needs referencing and more thorough and accurate explanation. e.g clinic based assessments- report on specificity and sensitivity to clearly detail the need for clinical judgement within the context of clinical practice. Also much examination is occurring of standardisation in terms of behaviours observed in on road assessments (VicRoads leading this) which needs to be reflected to be accurate. I agree that clinical judgement is the key, however, both the clinic and on-road assessments still have a place with strengths and limitations.

Tables need to be stand alone with keys to abbreviations included

Limitations- are pre registration students equal to novice OT driver assessors- generally need two years clinical experience prior to postgraduate training in driving assessment. This needs to be explored.

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?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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**Quality of written English**
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