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Reviewer's report:

The authors should take note of the following comments

The manuscript needs to be language edited

The authors used very old references. Out of 20 references only 2 were for 2013.

The methods section needs to be revisited. for instance, specify the dates of data collection and not two weeks. Who collected the data? it cannot be the 9 authors?

Sampling and sampling technique need to be revisited. There was no need to mention a survey in a qualitative study.

Under validity and reliability the authors did not mention what they did to ensure credibility it must be specific.

Results section is also problematic. For instance under personal and social characteristics why would the patients expect nurses to bow to them and in one finding, most of them were educated and so understanding the hospital policy. Why according to your findings will you select patients that you labelled as "dementia" The results lend themselves to so many queries. Why would speaking French be a problem? how many people come to your hospital speaking French.

As you read through the manuscript it appears as if the author was a doctoral student reporting on a part of her study and this needs to be explained as well.

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

Yes

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.

No

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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