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**Reviewer’s report:**

I do not think that the authors responded satisfactory to the comments but most important they do not support their decision for not modifying their MS

More specific:

1. Regarding Major Compulsory Revision

The authors chose to show us that training is important for the use of CAM-ICU. However, this is already known and they should have training before even they start the project. Thus their first part of the study is really a “so what” study.

2. Regarding the sample

The authors possible screen and assess the same patients as they did not keep records (see also below). So it was possible the same patient to be assessed many times in sort intervals and so the data are not independent and are correlated.

   “On every assessment day, we screened all patients in medical ICU and enrolled patients who were satisfied with inclusion criteria”……“The time between the assessments was various. While some patients could be evaluated consecutively, other patients were evaluated at admission and then just before leaving the medical ICU due to their medical conditions”

3. Regarding flow chart and number of assessments

The authors cannot inform us about the eligible, assessed, excluded, comatose, and others. Thus we do not know (and the authors of course) if one patient has been assessed 1, 2 or 3 times and others none. This introduce bias on the sample and the results are uncertain
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