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PDF covering letter
Improving stroke patients’ care: a patient held record is not enough

Avril Drummond’s comments

Abstract: methods section added. Six months after admission has been added to clarify timing.

Methods: justification currently in discussion moved to opening of methods section. Power of study moved from discussion to methods section. Duration of intervention phase clarified. Inclusion/exclusion criteria are clarified by giving clinical criteria used to define stroke. No stroke patients were excluded. Barthel reference updated to more accessible one recommended.

Results: should read entered into the study. Follow up is now clarified as 6 months post admission. Death rates were unexpectedly high and a comment about the inclusion of all patients is made in the discussion. “were not inclined to abandon hope” has been modified to “not lost hope”.

Discussion: I am not sure that patient recruitment could have affected the findings as we aimed to recruit all available patients to the study.

Tables have been labelled consistently as Phase A and Phase B

Richard Lindley’s comments

Statements about consent and ethical approval are now included in the methods section.

A note about the lack of involvement of doctors has been added to the discussion.

Other changes

1. Reference citations now precede punctuation marks.
2. All authors now added to citations as requested.
3. Tables now formatted in landscape.