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Reviewer's report:

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.

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.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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