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Reviewer’s report:

Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The authors lay out an ample background to the manuscript to arrive at their goal for the paper of applying a theoretical framework to describe the existing practice in a community and how the facets of that practice can be described. By using ethnographic methods they do describe recurrent themes for those who interact with the community paramedicine model and define the boundaries of the specialty. This approach is interesting and important, but does avoid some difficult questions such as how community paramedicine impacts mortality, improves the well-being of the community, or other surrogate markers of health like elders who remain as community dwellers rather than being placed in institutions.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
They describe their methodology, but perhaps could provide some additional education background to the methodology which is novel in the realm of medicine.

Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The authors describe arriving at themes and defining boundaries, although they do not clearly describe the iterative steps in this process completely. They do use supporting quotations from interviewees in the focus groups and some quotes from patients & families interviewed during the observation period.

Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
I was unable to find a limitations section in their discussion, and although perhaps less important, it would be helpful to describe potential limitations. Perhaps only those in favor or with positive experiences attended focus groups or were willing to be interviewed during community paramedicine contacts. Perhaps there were not significant coalescing of themes of negative comments and thus they were not included. Maybe on observation days certain facets or challenges did not occur and thus were not noted.

Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes, they do a good job of building their background.

Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes.

Is the writing acceptable? Yes.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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