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Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

This is a better paper now it has been revised. I am happy to recommend publication as it is but the authors may wish to amplify one point in relation to cases 3 and 4. In both of those cases the patient's neurological problems meant they were not legally competent to give (or refuse) consent to thrombolysis. At lines 382-390 and 392-397 the authors set out the conflict of (i) the need for consent in most cases and (ii) emergency surgery that does not require consent. I suggest that they apply this specifically to cases 3 and 4. The many RCTs say that these patients would have benefitted from thrombolysis yet it was not given because of objections from the family. The doctors' duty of care was to the patient, not the family, and in my opinion they should both have been treated. If a 3 year old child required emergency blood transfusion to save their life the mother, who was a Jehovah's witness, cannot prevent transfusion of her child because of her religious beliefs. I accept this is difficult.
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