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Reviewer's report:
The retrospective study sought to determine if the authors could identify specific pre-existing conditions (diabetes, hyperlipidemia, etc.), END and a pre-treatment DWI result that would predict a poor outcome in patients with minor stroke 60 days post-treatment with rt-PA.

I have a few minor notes/questions/edits listed below:

Page 6 line 155: Why are only males mentioned here when the study did include a small number of women?
Along these lines, were there differences observed between men and women in the study? The data is collected, so this should be a simple question to answer and possibly include in an expanded Table 2.
The major limitation to the study is the lack of women. Since this is a retrospective study this is not a fault of the authors, rather it needs to be addressed in the manuscript.

Discussion section: There is no description of what these results mean in terms of how this data can be used to HELP reduce unfavorable stroke outcomes in patients who show these specific conditions/DWI findings. Yes, the authors are able to identify these factors, but there is no mention of follow-through. Should these patients be monitored more closely after rt-PA treatment? I think this section in the paper needs to be expanded.

Figure 2 needs works: Expand flow chart to include binning patients into Group A or B. This will make the grouping of these patients easier to understand.
Table 1: Why are the stats for Males not included in the table while the stats for females are included?

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:
Acceptable
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