

Responses to reviewer comments

We would like to thank both reviewers for their comments which were clear and constructive. In particular, the advice to provide clear guidance on how the test can be best interpreted is a major improvement to the paper.

Reviewer 1:

- (1) We have addressed the use of abbreviations throughout and the corrections are shown in yellow highlighted text.
- (2) Thank you for highlighting this significant shortcoming – we have added a specific suggestion as to how the test can be interpreted and this is highlighted in blue in the text as follows
“This provides two levels of detail for assessing performance – a detailed ten point performance score as well as a simple 4 point scale where a binary (pass / fail) is distinguished by applying the cut off of a pass requiring that the subject completes the test without (omission) error within 30 seconds (if under 65 years old) or 60 seconds (if over 65 years old).” This is also alluded to in the abstract and core tip.

Reviewer 2:

- (1) We have addressed the use of abbreviations throughout and the corrections are shown in yellow highlighted text.
- (2) We have added the number of subjects included in each of the studies that report reliability along with the measures of reliability that were applied and the values that were identified.
- (3) Thank you for highlighting this significant shortcoming – we have added a specific suggestion as to how the test can be interpreted and this is highlighted in blue in the text as follows
“This provides two levels of detail for assessing performance – a detailed ten point performance score as well as a simple 4 point scale where a binary (pass / fail) is distinguished by applying the cut off of a pass requiring that the subject completes the test without (omission) error within 30 seconds (if under 65 years old) or 60 seconds (if over 65 years old).” This is also alluded to in the abstract and core tip.