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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you so much for reviewing my manuscript in consideration for publication. The corrections by the reviewers were acceptable and I have tackled them as follows:

Correction 1: What data was obtained from Hinari, PubMed, google scholar? Are these the databases for the lit review? : The author meant the data for literature review and this has been clarified.

Correction 2: Were the results for age and cause of alarm statistically significant? : Yes they were statistically significant and this has now been included in the study. Initially the first reviewer had suggested I do away with the significance but I have included it now.

Correction 3: Intensive care is listed but Critical Care is in the title and the body of the paper -it is suggested that the latter is included or replaces ICU: This has been corrected.

Correction 4: Tile page - Check spelling for 'Principal' Researcher Background- Noted and corrected

Correction 5: There is no mention of the relationship to patient deterioration but this is a suggested inclusion: There was no literature on the relationship between alarm beep and patient deterioration but this has been included now.

Correction 6: Line 47, Nurses in critical care units stated ...., need to say where the unit was located: This has been noted and the study area included.

Correction 7: Background in abstract and body of paper refers to patients who cannot speak for themselves, this should be most patients: Has been changed to most patients as suggested
Correction 8: Consistently use respondent or participant, but not both: I have stuck to respondents and done away with the term participants.

Correction 9: Consistently use CCU after the first mention of Critical Care Unit (CCU) and not a mixture of both after that: I have used Critical care for the first time then the subsequent times I have used CCU.

Correction 10: In the following section on raising the high alarm trigger to 130 bpm, need to add if there were any patient sequellae: |There were no patient sequellae to be quoted from the previous study.

Correction 11: Methods - Line 34 - need to add to sentence 'Approval to conduct the study was sought and provided by Kenyatta National Hospital......: This was noted and included.

Correction 12: Consistent spacing in stats 9 (10.3%) rather than 9(10.3%). Full stop at end of sentences: I have spaced where necessary and put the full stops where necessary.

Correction 13: Consistently report Tables in brackets on not, with capital letter or not and the word See or not in Results section. e.g. (See Table 2): I have reported the tables in brackets and I have ensured the word Table is starting with capital T.

Correction 14: Tables need formatting for clarity, if % appears in the column heading, it does not need to appear on each line under the heading. Heading columns and content needs to align and be on the same level. Column width needs to be relevant to the content and consistent in each column (See Table 3): The tables have been formatted.

Correction 15: Please consider which are the most interesting tables and reduce the number significantly. Readers of your work can contact you for further discussion on the details: The author has reduced the tables to six.

Correction 16: Abstract and throughout the body of the paper refers the the term 'averagely' which could be interpreted in different ways. Please reconstruct those sentences: These sentences have been rephrased so as the word averagely is not included.

Correction 17: Abstract Recommendation is to employ more nurses, this could not be found in the body of the paper, nor could any baseline employment data on which to base the 'More than what?' question which arises. Suggest this line is removed: The author agrees and this line has been removed.

Correction 18: Background: The background to the study is located in only 4 studies, and there are no other references to support this paper. What other studies were found in the recent literature to demonstrate a breadth of reading in the area and the methodological and statistical decisions made? For example IFAS, 2009 paragraph 2 Methods section: The author has included more references but could not cite the very current studies as of 2015 as the study was conducted in 2014.
Correction 19: Background line 12 on the caregiver response seems incomplete. A reference is required for line 23-25 and there is no requirement to add line 28 when the notion has been well explained in the previous 2 lines: This has been corrected

Correction 20: Line 57 needs have a completed reference for the AACN: This has been corrected

Correction 21: Methods Line 39. Emergency Unit with nurses is preferred to 'on nurses’; care for critically ill patients is preferred to 'deal with': The author has corrected this

Correction 22: Methods, second page Line 4, convenience sampling, Line 9 worked in the CCU for 6 months: Noted and corrected

Correction 23: Regarding electrode placement and best scores, does this mean is the most frequently reported? Does this apply to similar results beginning with best scores? : The word best scores has been substituted with the respondents scored.

Correction 24: Line 39. Once again no need to over explain what beep for long and rarely means. Line 21-24. Suggest delete the line, "this is a good thing as all alarms are important’. They may not be: Author agrees it was an over emphasis and the sentence was revised.

Correction 25: Conclusion: Leave out the sweeping statement about nurses overworked unless you have a reference, replace 'got' with received, also remove the word 'prove' as we cannot do that and suggest use the word support': Noted and statement left out and the word prove substituted with support

Correction 26: Suggestions for future research including all health professionals is very broad, do all health professionals currently respond to alarms? Try and focus this in a bit further: The term health professionals has been replaced with nurses, doctors and biomedical personnel.

I appreciate your time and look forward to publication of the manuscript soon.

Lucy Wankuru Meng’anyi