Thank you for asking me to review this well written and interesting paper. This piece of research highlights an important area, which as the authors say is going to become even more relevant as the number of older people and therefore the number of stroke patients increases.

Major Compulsory Revisions
There are no major flaws with this paper

Minor Essential Revisions
I think it is commendable that the author wants to provide better support to carers of stroke patients but I think as this is a research paper the author has to provide the reader with more information about the methodology so they can decide whether the results are biased or valid. I feel the following areas should be addressed.

1. What was the profession of the interviewers and how did they introduce themselves to the carers? (we have to expect that carers will say different things to health care professionals)
2. Who did the analysis of the results, was it the GP researcher?
3. Were the transcripts checked by the people being interviewed?
4. Were any service users involved in the research process or writing of the paper?
5. Some of the quotes do not support the researcher’s findings. This maybe because the wrong quote was chosen to illustrate the text. The quote below does not imply that the carers were not expecting anything. It implies that they didn’t like to ask but would have liked to have been offered.

‘... we’ve gone round there just to have the blood pressure checked at different times but ... they never say to us ‘Well come every three months’ or whatever – they don’t say that..... actually I would have liked someone to have kind of put
forward any suggestions or said ‘Is there any help or advice you need?’"

6. The conclusions are misleading and should be amended. I don’t think the research presented supports the comment in the conclusion:
‘However, it is clear is that general practice is well positioned to provide coordinated support to stroke survivors’

7. Page 11, 6th para, But should be By

8. Page 3 last line, Form should be From

Discretionary Revisions

9. When I read the results, the main conclusion I came to, was that the carers didn’t feel it was the place of the GP to offer them support because they didn’t have time. They wanted the GP to spend time on physical treatments of the stroke patient especially straight after the stroke. This also seemed to be what the practice staff were saying. This is a valid use of the GP and practice time and maybe the research finding is that the GP practice is good at this type of work and that the unmet needs of carers need to be addressed by a different agency. I agree that with the new commissioning procedures it will be important that GP’s know which services can support carers and carers themselves will know which services to ask for. But it is the job of every health and social care worker to assess for unmet need and to remind carers that there is support available. I disagree with the authors that we need a lot more research; we need to be supporting and helping the existing carer support services flourish so that every carer can easily access them. These services already exist but are patchy and not well funded and are provided in the main by charities such as The Stroke Association, The Carers Association and Age UK.
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