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Reviewer's report:

This study investigates the validity of a Korean version of CAM-ICU

Major Compulsory Revisions

My major concern about this paper is the reported “first period” of the study. In this first period of the study there was a low inter rater reliability and a low specificity and sensitivity of the CAM-ICU. The reason for that was the lack of previous training among the raters. Thus the authors prove the obvious: that is necessary a previous training to be able to use the CAM-ICU. I think this finding is already well known. My recommendation to authors is to remove this part as this part does not add anything to our knowledge and it makes the paper “weak” and more difficult to read it.

Minor Essential Revisions

Minor points

1. Are the assessed patients consecutive or randomly selected or the sample was a convenient sample?

2. Also it seems that there are missing data (missing assessments). I think here a flow chart with numbers of eligible, included, excluded, comatose, assessed, etc could help the reader.

3. In the second period of the study the authors state that they have 96 pairs of assessments in 22 patients. That means that some individuals had more than one assessment. If this happen the authors need to explain some questions e.g. what was the time between the assessments? Why some patients had one assessment and others two or more? Any change to estimate test-retest reliability?

Thank you for the privilege to let me reviewing the manuscript.
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