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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer reports and Response to Reviewers:

Jane Saucedo Braaten (Reviewer 1): I think this is an important area of research. RRT team leaders often come in "blind" and the information they need is often difficult to obtain in the emergent situation. I think this research is a great starting point with more development and knowledge needed in order to create a report for the RRT that reflects the current standing of the patient.

Comment: I would recommend a bit more discussion regarding the need for more research on the specific needs for information in an RRT situation especially a concise report of the event and what led up to the event. An electronic template to organize information needs is essential to an EHR. Thanks for your preliminary work on this.

Response: Thank you for your comments and review of this paper. We agree and have added a concluding sentence to incorporate the importance of further work to assess the needs of the RRT.

Harry Hochheiser, PhD (Reviewer 2): This paper presents a survey of rapid-response team practitioners, aimed at understanding data needs pertinent to event response. Using methodology and content developed by the team and adapted from prior publications, this survey asked participants to provide Likert-scale rankings of the utility of 45 items. Responses from ~ 25% of
the survey pool identified several items that were highly ranked across different classes of practitioners.

The results of this study seem to have a fair amount of face validity - seeing items such as heart rate and blood pressure at the top of the list makes a good deal of sense. This reduces some of my concern about the acknowledged limitation of the small sample size.

Comment: I was struck by one sentence that seems hard to justify - "Novel EMR interfaces have had mostly positive responses when implemented in academic medical centers." This is a very hard statement to defend when based on only four papers cited later in the paragraph. I suggest rephrasing.

The discussion seems longer than necessary given the relative simplicity of the methods and the lack of surprise in the results.

Response: Thank you for your comments and review. We agree and have reduced the length of the discussion section and also addressed some grammatical issues in the paper. We have also modified the sentence - "Novel EMR interfaces have had mostly positive responses when implemented in academic medical centers" in the introduction.