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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed the prior reviews well. A few grammatical or structural suggestions may improve the final version:

- In the abstract and methods, "...paramedics were consented..." is a common usage but "consent" is not a transitive verb. Usually, authors write "...paramedics provided consent..."

- In Results, Section 4.5, the text states that clinical outcomes are not examined, but the clinical outcomes are in Table 2. It would be better to write that "clinical outcomes are in Table 2, but we made no comparison between groups because of the feasibility design and small sample size."

- In Results, Section 4.4, the ABG results appear to be averages: include also a SD or some measure of spread.

- Table 5, first data cell has "1 (6) (1) (10l)" which probably means "1 subject (6%) with a flow at 10 l/min" It is great and informative to have the actual flow rates in the table, but clarify the notation somehow.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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