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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
N/A - no methodology

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
N/A - no experiments or analyses

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
N/A - no results to interpret

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Two critical revisions were made and solved in an appropriate manner. The one on the continental and not international scope of the paper; and the one on the consensus. Authors, made clear that this is an endorsement of care for delirium in a specific region. That gives the reader a clear impression of what the paper is about and what to expect. I think that even though they are two apparently minor issues, changing them, gives the work consistency. In addition, a clear objective is now available from the abstract, and it is quite clear
that this manuscript is an endorsement of a multi professional approach to delirium. Authors not only give a point by point response, but also include the additions on the response in order to have a quick look on the changes performed. This revised version is more clear and consistent than the previous one, it is a quite interesting work now.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Even though in the previous version they mentioned that this was a consensus paper, that would have had the need of a methodology, this version is presented as an endorsement, therefore no methodology needed.

Some minor points could improve even further the manuscript:

- The title may benefit from deleting 'Europe' at the end, since it is already stated that it is a European work, maybe substituting Europe with 'region' could be less redundant.

- What other areas besides health care, could this approach could benefit from. For example, translation of knowledge, health promotion and education on the phenomenon.

- Do authors think there must be a leader in the suggested approach? What has happened to initiatives managing delirium by solitary professionals? What role does communication plays in this suggested approach? Besides the leader, should there be specific roles for each professional? What about the economic aspects of this approach?

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

I still think the figure 1 is non-informative or could be improved.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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