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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript explores the reliability and content validity of cognitive tests in Indigenous Australians.

Given the low number of psychometric studies in this population, this study is of considerable relevance. The manuscript is well written and the methods are largely appropriate.

Nonetheless, I have a few comments I would like the authors to address.

Major:

1. I understand the subjects were inpatients at time of the study and time between test and retest ranged from 1 to 5 days. It would be good to know what treatments the subjects were undergoing during this period and to discuss whether this could have influenced test-retest reliability, e.g. patients may have improved due to medication etc.

2. It would be better to use ICCs instead of Pearson correlations to analyze test-retest reliability because - if you assume that their cognitive abilities stay the same during the study period - you are interested in absolute, not relative agreement. Moreover measurements are nested in subjects.

3. I would like you to discuss reasons for attrition in more detail and why it was different for the various tests. 43% were lost for SMRT. Was that because subjects refused? At some point you should mention reasons for drop out. Maybe provide a flow chart.

Minor:

1. Please mention inter-rater reliability for SMRT in the abstract.
2. Though effect sizes are small and it probably does not make a difference, I suggest using non-parametric tests for comparing baselines and retest scores, given the small number of subjects.

3. Some quotations of patients are repeatedly given. Though they may have been linked to several topics, these repetitions may be avoided.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**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.

Yes

**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.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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