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Reviewer's report:

Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

I do not know if the question is new, but the question is not well defined when reference is made to adapting existing tools. Based on the title, the focus should be on provider barriers and facilitators but paper discusses adapting existing tools for secondary stroke into existing healthcare system – focus of paper not clear. Also, abstract and body of paper reference the “guidelines” but they are not explained; were authors trying to measure adherence to guidelines by providers?

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

The method is termed “formative evaluation.” I suggest the authors provide a definition and add a short statement on their use of qualitative research.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

The authors state that interviews delved into current practices to prevent a second stroke, barriers to secondary stroke prevention, current levels of knowledge regarding secondary stroke prevention, and resources needed for enhanced secondary stroke prevention. Table 1 and discussion in the manuscript refer to primary prevention themes but these do not appear to be themes. They appear to be interview topics. The authors note three emergent primary themes under the discussion heading: current provider practices in secondary stroke risk factor management; barriers and supports to secondary stroke risk factor management; advice on how to enhance secondary stroke risk factor management. Again, these are interview topics. The secondary prevention themes appear to be the themes from the interviews.

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?

Again, the discussion covers what are referred to as themes but they appear to
6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
No. The abstract refers to the adaptation of existing tools and guidelines, but there is little discussion of the TOOLS intervention and guidelines.

7. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
  # Distinguish primary prevention themes and interview topics
  # Explain the TOOLS intervention and “guidelines” and how they relate to the purpose of the study
  # Provide discussion of how secondary prevention themes can inform next steps/conclusions/recommendations

- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
  # Spell out VHA in title of manuscript
  # Indicate how many participants there were for pilots of the interview guides
  # Briefly explain how intervention mapping was used to query providers
  # Indicate number of study team members who conducted interviews and timeframe for the interviews; e.g., number of months
  # How did responses differ based on provider’s role in continuum of stroke care (e.g., physician, social worker)? This is important because there were specific interview guides based on role responsibilities
  # Table 2 contains relatively large percentages in the “other” category. Provide an explanation of “other.”
  # Authors state that they queried providers on theoretical components, guideline care processes, and practical strategies for delivering secondary stroke prevention. Where is discussion of theoretical components and guideline care processes?
  # Explain AHA Peer to Peer program

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
  None

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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