Comments regarding the study:

Community paramedic point of care testing by Blanchard et al.

The study describes a validation process in which the feasibility and the quality of POCT in the hands of community paramedics is investigated.

General comments: The concept of community paramedics is not uniformly applied in Europe. The authors might elucidate the function of said group of professionals.

The study is lacking slightly in description of chain of events. It is thus unclear which criteria were applied for enrolling patients? The authors state that 1,649 events were screened for enrollment, 174 had a blood draw, with 108 events (62.1%) enrolled from 73 participants.

The enrolling of patients is incomprehensible: 1649 patients were screened. This part is understandable. However, the next part is incomprehensible: In 174 patient care events, a blood sample was drawn. How do the authors end up with 108 events (what is an event) in 73 patients (what about the remaining 101 "events"? What did they represent?) I realize that Figure 1 obviously helps. However, the number of patients - and the number of blood samples and the number of failed blood samples is not crystal clear.

Why such a discrepancy between enrolled patients and number of events? Did the blood sampling fail in 37.9% of the cases?

Should one apply the intention-to-treat principles, based on my understanding of the reported results, the results are rather less favorable and claimed in the abstract. I am not sure that the claim that CP programs can expect valid results is supported by the data presented.

Minor details: It is interesting that the i-Stat quality control seems to fail: The proportion of out-of-range results by device number 6 was (significantly) larger than in the other i-Stats. Do the authors have any supplemental comments? Did the company offer any explanation?

A problem on line 435 that should be solved.
Statistics seems appropriate.

Figures are clearly aiding in the understanding of the study.

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

No

**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.

No

**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.
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