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Reviewer's report:

The authors use a qualitative methods of interviews in this study which is not used very frequently. This approach and the topic of precipitate birth in prehospital environment can demonstrate the necessity of soft skills and communication and these aspects of EMS work are more and more important now and illustrates the shift form care based just on biological approach to patient-centered and individualised care.

I’d recommend some details that could help reader in better understanding of the problem.

In the Methods and Result section the authors write that they interviewed 22 women. How many unplanned births were during the study period? - how many % are the interviewed of all?

The recruitment was absolutely free or were there some inclusion criteria to cover the diversity of age, social group, status, education etc (so that the research should match the picture of the society)?

In the Results section and in Discussion and also in citations.

Based on citations and results it emerges that some women were satisfied and other dissatisfied with paramedics behaviour, communication, consent, respect and empathy and confidence. Was positive or negative evaluation of the experience prevailing? It would be interesting to compare satisfaction and dissatisfaction in particular items and also how many women rated positively and how many negatively.

However, I consider the paper interesting and with a novel approach to EMS work and I recommend for publication.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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