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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting hypothetical analysis. The paper extends previous published work and examines the potential clinical impact on outcomes of improving the accuracy of the RACE score -which the analysis suggests is small. Some suggestions:

Abstract: given the hypothetical analysis, the conclusion is strongly worded. Please included the context.

Methods: Methods, as written, assume knowledge. While I recognise there is reference to another paper for methods this may be annoying to readers for important concepts. For example, it might be useful to the reader to provide a description of the RACE score and its accuracy in measuring stroke severity.

Results: Written results are fairly light. Perhaps detail an example?

Discussion: Is also light and more detail may provide the reader with more confidence in the modelling. For example, how do you explain the great effect for medium severity strokes? What are the implications for your data if correct (and in light of your previous paper)? What are the limitation of the study that may need to be considered in future studies?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
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.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal