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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript titled "Exploring the reliability and acceptability of cognitive tests for Indigenous Australians: A Pilot Study" aims to investigate reliability and acceptability of four cognitive tests in Indigenous Australians. The authors concluded that reliability of four tests were high enough to use in future studies. This is an interesting and good beginning example of research attempting to adopt English cognitive tests in people with other cultural backgrounds although they did not confirm validity of those cognitive tests.

I have following comments to the authors:

1. Main text and Table 1 did not include any information about patient diagnosis and condition. It is critical information for readers to examine significance and limitations of this study. Particularly, if their diseases include acute phase neurological disease, short-term reliability would be lower than expected. Please describe inclusion and exclusion criteria and clarify those points.

2. Generally, test-retest intervals for reliability assessment range from a week to a month. To assess test-retest reliability, 1-5 days interval seems too short. Please explain the rationale for this short interval.

3. ICC was used to check only inter-rater reliability for SMRT, but ICC is also useful to check intra-individual test-retest reliability for all four cognitive tests.

4. In Acceptability Interview Analysis, the phenomenological approach was employed for analysis of interviewed data. Rationale of the approach should be cited in the section because phenomenological approaches could differ according to its theoretical background.

5. First language of a large part of the patients was not English. As the authors describe shortly in Discussion section, please describe the reasons to use the English version in Introduction or Methods section.

6. Did the participants understand test instructions properly? If the authors checked it in the interview, please show the information.
7. In page 17, results showed that patients were interrupted or distracted for some reasons. Did those interruption or distraction affect the test performances?

8. In page 24, the sentence 'Interview data suggested that the tests demonstrated face validity as they were viewed as a good way to "test the brain"' include patient's verbatim, but I cannot find such description in Results section.

9. Please discuss about wide-range of confidence intervals in correlation coefficients between baseline and retest, which may be due to limited number of patients who participated both baseline and follow-up assessment.

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

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**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

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal