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Author’s response to reviews:

1. Abstract: The researchers looked at the methods and included something on the questionnaire as requested. The statistical tests were also removed from the methods and also the statement data was obtained from Hinari, Pubmed and Google scholar. In the results the researchers removed the statistical association between the variables as they tested the responses of the respondents against the questionnaire instead of using Chi square and Cramers V to get a statistical association.

2. The sentence in the introduction section “A caregiver’s “probability match” is the alarm response based on the perceived true alarm rate. If an alarm system is perceived to be 90% reliable, the response rate will be about 90%, if the alarm system is perceived to be 10% reliable, the response rate will be about 10%.” Has been rephrased so that it now makes sense.

3. The paragraph “Thus signal duration is an important influence to the nurses’ response but workload, patient condition and task complexity may lead to other reaction strategies”. “According to the American Association of Critical-Care Nurses (AACN) practice alerts, alarm fatigue develops when a person is exposed to an excessive number of alarms of which most could be false alarms. This may result in sensory overload, which may cause the person to become desensitized to the alarms. Patient deaths have been attributed to alarm fatigue. American Association of Critical-Care Nurses therefore has suggested several strategies to improve patient safety in the event of reducing the number of false alarms.” Has now been referenced as suggested.

4. In methods section, the authors have included how the questionnaire was pretested to confirm validity and reliability

5. The reviewer requested the introduction section to be revised. The authors did not understand whether it is the introduction bit of the abstract or the background. The background has literature review. Perhaps the reviewer can clarify this.
Finally in the results section in the main body of the manuscript the authors removed the statistical tests and tested the questionnaire against the socio-demographic factors as suggested. The tables showing these are in the tables’ document.