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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed the reviewers' comments and improved the manuscript.

There are solely some minor issues left to correct.

1. Page 10, line 32: "sample was […] representative". A representative sample is a random sample of the target population. Please write something like "The sample was intended to reflect characteristics …".

2. Page 11, 29: That health care is delivered in English is not a good argument for using English language tests. Why do you not state that the tests were available in English only and you wanted to select the best for your RCT which would then be translated into the most common Aboriginal languages?

3. Page 15, line 43. If you use ICCs which are more appropriate for your design because of nesting of measurements in patients you do not need to report Pearson correlations at the same time. Easy to solve: just drop Pearson correlations.

4. Discussion: End discussion with some conclusion about which test you will use for your RCT.

5. Page 17, line 49: Sentence "To ensure that […]". Move to Methods.

6. Table 1: Please state statistical method for comparison in heading or legend.

7. Table 4: Drop Pearson correlations.

8. Table 5: In heading write "Inter-rater reliability analysis based on ICC …".

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.
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**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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