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Reviewer's report:

I refer to the manuscript below that I have been asked to review:

'Providing opportunity for long term rehabilitation to people with stroke in a developing country: Findings from focus group discussions. '

Nor Azlin Mohd Nordin, Noor Azah Aziz, Devinder Kaur Ajit Singh, Aznida Firzah Abd Aziz, Nor Aishah Omar Othman and Syed Mohamed Aljunid Syed Junid
BMC Health Services Research

I have reviewed the paper today and I regret that I cannot recommend publication as it is currently presented. It is written clearly and refers to a very interesting and relevant topic however, there is no description of ethical approval of the study which would be required for research of this nature. It would be of concern if the researchers, who may have been involved in the care of the people with stroke, contacted them directly to request participation in the study.

There is less of a concern for the professional participants.

The second key issues relates to the methodology. Two focus groups is insufficient to achieve saturation on a topic of this nature. A larger number would be required with iterative data analysis to achieve saturation.

Perhaps if this study was represented as an exploratory study, it would be more appropriate because the otherwise the authors are making inappropriate claims for the methodology and overstating the results in the conclusions.

These suggestions represent major compulsory revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

With respect to your specific questions
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? No
3. Are the data sound? No
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Not sufficiently
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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