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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes, this study attempts to answer an important clinical question: how to better design clinical alerts so clinicians can better manage and follow-up with patients.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes, the description of how the data were coded and the flow chart summarizing the coding processes were most helpful. The data coding and analysis process was comprehensive and controlled for individual bias.

3. Are the data sound? Adequate quotes from the data were given in the text to support the authors' interpretations.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? yes

Minor Essential Revision:

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? The title is not descriptive of the study. The study is about identifying barriers to and solutions for electronic alerts to clinicians in the outpatient setting. The title should better reflect the content of the study.

9. Is the writing acceptable? Writing style is direct, clear, and easy to follow and understand.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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