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Reviewer’s report:

This is a well written, clear manuscript. The number of patients is small but this represents the feasibility of a medication coaching program for stroke patients. Overall there was not much of an impact in "coached" patients but this is likely due to the small numbers and the short follow up. This paradigm for coaching also reduces costs compared to MD or pharmacist follow up. There was a trend for the coached patients to follow up after discharge.

Importantly barriers have been identified that will be of great use in designing the next phase of this work.

Major Revisions:

Did the patients have aphasia? Was there an attempt to classify Stroke etiology by TOAST?

Were patients all English speaking?

Did the telephone coaching always occur with only the patient or were family members also involved in these conversations?

Minor

One limitation is that the patients were quite young, and may not represent the actual stroke population that would be targeted with these therapies. This should be mentioned as a limitation. Also including stroke and TIA is likely to introduce bias. THE NIHSS is so low in these patients, generalizing to all stroke patients is probably incorrect. These patients fall into the "non-disabling stroke" category.

Coumadin use will also bias these results (although a low number of patients had afib, about 10% again reflecting the young age of the patients). This should be reported as the patients on anticoagulants are likely to have closer follow-up.

The use of this population is not a negative, these are in fact the patients that an intervention like this should target (as they can be "coached", are discharged to home, and are not "disabled" from their stroke making secondary prevention high gain. This should be discussed briefly.

Cost effectiveness may be another variable to assess in the future in a larger study.
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