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Reviewer's report:

General
The manuscript has been revised accurately and is easy reading now compared to the previous version.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
- typo at page 2, first line: ... and with little effort "they" can enable ...
- methods section: the SD of patient stay is missing
- results section, reliability: Pearson r of vital function/oxygen saturation should read as "<" 0.20 in stead of ">"
- results section, construct validity, second last sentence on page 5: the range between which the items load is 0.762 and 0.955 in stead of 0.949???
- results section, user-friendliness, third sentence: nurse experienced some problems in rating all items. I think this should read as: ... rating in "some" items + which items?. Also, nurses had some doubts regarding the relevance of items. Please mention which items.
- typo in discussion part, page 8, third last sentence: Availability "of" an assessment tool ...
- table 1: add "Chronbach's alpha" in the title
- table 3 should read as table 4 + add the cut-off score of the NEECHAM used for which the diagnostic values were measured.
- table 5 about component loadings should read as table 3 + add "n = 253" in the title
- typo in the first item of table 5 about userfriendeliness: how much time did you need to "rate" ...

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
- Although the authors state in their letter that they followed my suggestion to give a frequency table for the items in table 5, mean values are still given. If this will be changed, the last sentence of the statistical analysis part in the text should be changed accordingly.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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