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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for allowing me to review this article. Having read the proposed article I feel that it should be revised and resubmitted. This paper requires major changes. These changes include:

1 - Abstract of your article is very poor. For example in your methods and material, I not found any information about your questionnaire. It's better that statistical test deleted from abstract. Results section of abstract also is very poor.

2 - What's your means from "Data obtained from; Hinari, Pubmed, Google scholar" in abstract section.

3 - I have concerns about the article however. I think you need to take care with your written expression, sentence structure, supporting references and punctuation. In some cases there are very long sentences that are difficult to read and do not add clarity to what you are trying to say. For example "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%." In introduction section.

4 - Authors also used some sentence that needs references. For example "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."

5 - I think to introduction should be revised. Authors should write literate review for this section.

6 - In methods section, authors mentioned that used self-designed questioner for data collection. However, I not found any information about questions of this questionnaire, validity and reliability of questionnaire, and individual who designed questionnaire. This information is very important. how questionnaires were collected. Surely if the researcher was involved in collecting
the questionnaire this may have influenced results? Should the questionnaires be administered by someone not involved in the study? How was your questionnaire scored?

In results section we found that authors tested correlations and relationship between demographics characteristics and questions. For example " A statistically significant association (p=0.06) was shown between age and "I assess the cause of the alarm beep when it alarms". This is not good. I think that author should score your questionnaire and after this tested total score of all questions with demographics characteristics.
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