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Reviewer's report:

I enjoyed reading this paper. It is appropriate that asynchronous alerts receive attention. The methods are appropriate and the results and discussion speak for themselves. A few remarks. The authors use a lot of abbreviations that at the end confuse the reader. In the methods they write focus groups were held with personnel from backgrounds (primary care, radiology, etc.), and then they talk about PCPs. I interpreted PCPs as primary care providers, but my question is who they are. Are they only primary care physicians and nurses, or are radiology, IT and lab personnel also seen as PCPs. I appreciate clarification. On page 11 the authors refer to the "high volume" of alerts. In the combination with the term human factors high volume can at first glance be construed as a high sound level. It becomes later clear that high volume is about large numbers (of alerts). In order to avoid such confusion I suggest to make clear that is about a high number of alerts sitting in box that makes the providers nervous. Rightfully the authors assert that it is not only the technology that is the problem. Organizational, workflow and personnel related factors are equally important. But the now the title "... thinking beyond technology" promises too much. There is a suggestion how the interface might be improved, but nothing about the non-IT related problems. Do the authors harbor any ideas on that? Lastly there are typing errors (I suspect that their EndNote database contains a few errors). References 19 and 20 are not correct. See below for correct quotation:


And the print history of reference 22 needs not to be quoted as well:


My general advise is to check the references, including the use of abbreviations for journals. The authors are not consistent across the board.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
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