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(I indicate as line the left column number).

I found the study of great interest and I noticed only minor suggestions.

1. I suggest adding the word "may" page 4 line 10: "stroke survivors and their carers may feel ..."

2. I think there is a mistake in page 5 line: "This paper reports focus groups and a feasibility study which were used to develop and feasibility (?)"

3. page 5 line 34: There are too many round brackets: (general practitioners (GPs) ...). From here on, replace "general practitioners" with "GPs". Too many round brackets in page 9 line 16, too.

4. page 5 line 45: I suggest to remove "ethnically", because this feature is not then considered in the study.

5. Table 2. There is a mistake: 8 men + 6 women = 14, not 12.

6. Table 1: inside text it's mentioned after table 2. Moreover, I think that the "Changes made to the checklist following feasibility study" (page 10 line 20) should be shown in a final table, different from table 1.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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