

Author's response to reviews

Title: Recognition of delirium in ICU patients A diagnostic study of the NEECHAM confusion scale in ICU patients

Authors:

Henny Immers (Henny.immers@hetnet.nl)

Marieke J Schuurmans (m.j.schuurmans@med.uu.nl)

Jaap J Bijl van der (j.j.vanderbijl@med.uu.nl)

Version: 3 **Date:** 11 October 2005

Author's response to reviews: see over

Dear editor,

Thank you again for considering our manuscript for publication in BMC Nursing. We thank the referees for their valid and thoughtful comments on the revised manuscript and apologize for inaccuracies. We acknowledge almost all of the points given by them and tried to change the manuscript accordingly. This revised manuscript is, as suggested, edited by Biomedes.

Hereby we will describe a detailed overview of our responses.
We hope you will consider the article in this present form for publication.

Yours sincerely,

Marieke Schuurmans

Responses to reviewer 1

Major compulsory revisions

1. Reference op DSM is updated
2. Text was rewritten to enhance readability, comments made are included.
3. Concurrent validity was measured with the DSMcriteria.
4. Information on determination of user-friendliness is added.
5. Text on suggestions of the nurses is rewritten, comments made are included.
6. Sentence is added on shortening the scale.

Minor essential revisions

1. The manuscript has been edited as suggested by Biomedes, UK.
2. We've changed scales to ratings.
3. Superscript is changed by subscript.

Responses to reviewer 2

Minor essential revisions

- Typo is corrected.
- SD was added, apology for not doing so in the former version.
- Reviewer is correct, > is changed in <.
- Reviewer is correct, range is changed.
- Part on opinion of the nurses is rewritten, comments made are included.
- Typo is corrected.
- Table 1 Cronbach alpha is not added in the title as suggested. We decided to delete the Cronbach alpha from the Table since this result was given in the text.
- Reviewer is correct, table numbers are changed, cut-off score of NEECHAM and n are added as suggested.
- Typo is corrected.

Discretionary revisions

The reviewer is correct, after the first review we adopted the suggestion of making a table to present the results of the questionnaire. We made this table with mean values (SD) instead of following the suggestion of a frequency table. Given the results we did not think a frequency table would give additional insights. In the response to the reviewer we overlooked the fact that we did not follow the exact suggestion and therefore did not respond correctly.