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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Please describe in more detail (in addition to the reference) how diagnoses for stroke are obtained and whether the authors are able to tell if these are new diagnoses of stroke or just new patients in the system with prior diagnoses of stroke. Since the analyses are based on this index stroke date, this point is crucial to the analyses.

2. Minor Essential Revisions
   page 3: The analyses inform the design of cluster randomised trial of computerised decision support. There is a typo and this sentence needs clarification, it would perhaps be more fitting in the discussion.
   page 12: (1st paragraph) The factors underlying practice level variation could further help the implementation of the guidelines for secondary stroke prevention, and outcome that will be addressed through our research. typo

3. Discretionary Revisions
   Substantial variation in adherence to stroke secondary prevention recommendations among family practices was found. This finding is not elaborated upon in the discussion. Is there any postulation about why there is such variation? Are demographic characteristics of the practices known or were they evaluated in any way?
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