PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (**http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf**) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Examining Consensus for a Standardized Patient Assessment in Community Paramedicine Home Visits: a RAND/UCLA modified Delphi Study
AUTHORS	Leyenaar, Matthew; Strum, Ryan; Batt, Alan; Sinha, Samir; Nolan, Michael; Agarwal, Gina; Tavares, Walter; Costa, Andrew P

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	L. Vloet HAN University of Applied Science, Nijmegen, the Netherlands
REVIEW RETURNED	03-Jul-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	- add the country to your affiliations abstract: include number of experts, results are briefly described. Need some more details - information about the triage system is lacking. In the introduction is described that paramedic programs partner with primary care providers. Does the professional who provided care effect competences (needed?), assessment? patient outcomes e.g.? I would like to read something about that in the discussion Methods: no information on the literature research as input for the Delphi is provided in the manuscript, just the reference to a previous review. Information should be added to the manuscript. Unclear who and how 'grouped into assessment categories based on broad themes such as social factors, functional abilities, or ongoing health conditions' and if and how agreement has been reached. No ethics paragraph described Discussion: in the discussion only a comparison is made between the different paramedical courses. There is no comparison with a general practitioner and the competences. And what does this mean for triage? They describe the ideal situation, but do not give an insight in the actual situation and how to implement the findings.

REVIEWER	Peter Lucas University of Tasmania, Australia
REVIEW RETURNED	05-Jul-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	This paper presents finding from a modified Delphi study seeking to establish consensus on assessment items for use by community paramedics on home visits. This model of paramedic service delivery is likely to become increasingly used to meet the demands of contemporary demographic and epidemiological transitions.

The paper recognises that community paramedicine programs are in the early stages of development, however, some elaboration on the social and economic factors that are driving the growth of these programs would strengthen the paper. That would only require a couple of sentences to contextualise the environment in which these programs are emerging.

The limitations of the study are appropriately recognised in the manuscript.

A key issue that needs clarification/attention is:

Results – "Fifteen individuals agreed to participate.. " (P7,L18), however, Table 1 (P8, L33-34) states 17. If this was because some individuals had more than one role then that should be made clear, otherwise needs correcting/revision.

The paper is generally well written apart from a few instances where word choice or sentence structure could be improved. Specific issues are as follows:

Page 5
Line 15 "…it is not clear whether or not…" – reword
Line 23 "demonstrating" – ensuring?

Page 6
Line 28 – should be ensuring not insuring

Page 7
Line 7-8 – last sentence needs rewording

Page 12
Line 26 – grammar - should be "exist" not "exists"
Line 29-30 – "Finding that an international panel of experts found …" reword.
Line 48 – finding consensus – reaching or achieving more appropriate terms.

Page 13
Line 39 – panle? Should be panel.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1
Reviewer Name: L. Vloet
Institution and Country: HAN University of Applied Science, Nijmegen, the Netherlands
Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below
- add the country to your affiliations

Country added to each institution.

abstract: include number of experts, results are briefly described. Need some more details

Number of experts added. Results expanded.

- information about the triage system is lacking. In the introduction is described that paramedic programs partner with primary care providers. Does the professional who provided care effect competences (needed?), assessment? patient outcomes e.g.? I would like to read something about that in the discussion

Please refer to the manuscript for additional details added pertaining to case finding, paramedic training, and integration of care. Further context of findings to these challenges is raised in the DISCUSSION section also.

Methods: no information on the literature research as input for the Delphi is provided in the manuscript, just the reference to a previous review. Information should be added to the manuscript.

Further information about the methodology of the literature search has been added.

Unclear who and how 'grouped into assessment categories based on broad themes such as social factors, functional abilities, or ongoing health conditions' and if and how agreement has been reached.

Information provided about grouping process.

No ethics paragraph described

Ethics is described in the first paragraph of the METHODS section.

Discussion: in the discussion only a comparison is made between the different paramedical courses. There is no comparison with a general practitioner and the competences.

The opening paragraph describes similarities between traditional emergency setting practices and non-emergency community paramedicine practices.

And what does this mean for triage? They describe the ideal situation, but do not give an insight in the actual situation and how to implement the findings.

Additional context has been added to the Future work section of the DISCUSSION including mention of an ongoing study that has drawn on the findings.

Reviewer: 2
Reviewer Name: Peter Lucas
Institution and Country: University of Tasmania, Australia
Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below
This paper presents finding from a modified Delphi study seeking to establish consensus on assessment items for use by community paramedics on home visits. This model of paramedic service delivery is likely to become increasingly used to meet the demands of contemporary demographic and epidemiological transitions.

The paper recognises that community paramedicine programs are in the early stages of development, however, some elaboration on the social and economic factors that are driving the growth of these

programs would strengthen the paper. That would only require a couple of sentences to contextualise the environment in which these programs are emerging.

Revisions to INTRODUCTION have included more context behind factors contributing to community paramedicine program development.

The limitations of the study are appropriately recognised in the manuscript.

A key issue that needs clarification/attention is:

Results – "Fifteen individuals agreed to participate.. " (P7,L18), however, Table 1 (P8, L33-34) states 17. If this was because some individuals had more than one role then that should be made clear, otherwise needs correcting/revision.

Corrected. Seventeen is the correct number.

The paper is generally well written apart from a few instances where word choice or sentence structure could be improved. Specific issues are as follows:

Page 5
Line 15 "…it is not clear whether or not…" – reword
Line 23 "demonstrating" – ensuring?

Page 6
Line 28 – should be ensuring not insuring

Page 7
Line 7-8 – last sentence needs rewording

Page 12
Line 26 – grammar - should be "exist" not "exists"
Line 29-30 – "Finding that an international panel of experts found …" reword.
Line 48 – finding consensus – reaching or achieving more appropriate terms.

Page 13
Line 39 – panle? Should be panel.

Edits or corrections made at each of these lines. Thank you for these suggestions.