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Reviewer's report:

The authors have submitted a systematic review and meta-analysis of interventions aimed at improving rates of stroke thrombolysis. The methods and the associated weakness, as well as possible publication bias, are well written and acknowledged. Minor comments include that many systematic reviews are now a priori registered with services such as PROSPERO which was not done in the this case in order to reduce bias. The interventions appear to be only effective targeted at EMS, while the others were not statistically significant. The comments in the discussion on whether to improve thrombolysis should therefore be guided by local barriers are sensical but not supported by the data in this manuscript - ie the studies in this analysis were not designed under those hypotheses. It is also important to note which ones were significant or not and displaying those within the summary of effect sizes separately (eg the figure with interventions "stratified" by the specific "target" with the with references for those). Otherwise the intervention are so heterogenous that comparing them has less clinical utility.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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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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Quality of written English
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