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The research area of this paper is highly relevant to clinical practice with current emphasis on national targets on reducing stroke. The authors have used a qualitative methodology to examine the poor uptake of aspirin for secondary prevention of stroke.

Compulsory revisions
The background needs to place implementation in the context of the general literature on challenges of implementing evidence into clinical practice. [1]

There are a number of methodological questions that need to be addressed:
1. A convenience sample was used and needs to be justified
2. Also why were only 15 participants chosen and this needs to be linked to theoretical saturation?
3. How did the interviewer introduce this area with the participants? Were they asked to recall cases they had managed in the past year or longer? Were they asked to keep a log of cases for a period before the interview?
4. Where did the interviews take place and how long were they?
5. In view of volume and complexity of transcripts, were any software packages used for the analysis of the transcripts?
6. In terms of validation, who was involved in the analysis as it seems DS was the only one involved with constructing the themes? If so, the implications of the this needs stating in the discussion? were any field notes taken?

In the methods section, the authors state that respondents varied by ethnic group and this is not indicated in table 1.
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