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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for inviting me to review this article. I have just few minor comments:

Title and Abstract
Title is clear and corresponds with the results.

Abstract - p.2 line 12-19: "The objective of this study was to develop a consensus (…) regarding evaluation measures for the implementation of an …" The objective of the study seems to not correspond with the title.

Conclusion p. 3 line 2-3 - "There are currently no published measures for evaluating the implementation of an ED early warning score system."

From my point of view this study is not about measures of evaluating the implementation but more about the measure of the effect of EWS after the implementation (see the Results and Discussion part below). There is more than one study about the evaluation of implementation, but truly not about the EWS, but about the cognitive aid in general (e.g. Alidina, 2018).

Background
The background is described including the reasons for providing the study and publishing this research.

Methods
The methods are well described in detail, which allows reproducibility of similar study.

Results
Results are well described in detail. Results and Discussion When I was reading it I found that the authors are writing about the implementation (Abstract - p.2 line 12-19: "The objective of this study was to develop a consensus (…) regarding evaluation measures for the implementation of an …"); Discussion p. 11 line 54 - 60: "measures to use for the implementation for an ED-specific…" and "recommended categories for evaluating the implementation of a new…"). I found it confusing for me because the categories described in results and discussion are more about the impact or effect of the EWS and not about the implementation itself. I think that the aim of the study might be reformulated to state that the aim is not in the implementation process but in the effect which the ED-ACE can have.

Discussion
The discussion supports the results with references and includes the limitation of the study.

References
References used are mainly from the last 10 years, listed appropriately.

Tables and figure
Reasonable and described with a reference in the text.

Summary
Overall, this study is well-written, the methodology is and the results are clear and detailed. Just minor changes might be done to gain better understanding of the aim of the study. I thank the authors for their work on this manuscript and for the opportunity to provide these comments.
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