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Reviewer's report:

According to the instructions for authors the debate paper should include these sections
Abstract, Keywords, Background, Main text, Conclusions, List of abbreviations.

I can't find the " Background", "Main text", and "Conclusions" paragraphs. Please rename paragraphs, according to the instructions for authors https://bmcmedethics.biomedcentral.com/submission-guidelines/preparing-your-manuscript/debate

Line 131-132 I can't understand what the author means with the phrase "the doctors being afraid of bleeding complications" following the sentence "prior to the occurrence of this therapy, aspects of legal medicine involved in this field of medical expertise have already been reported". I can't understand the logical frame of this sentence.

Line 209 the error "On his behalf, the neurologist 209 explained the reasons his his refusal"

Line 489 "have the moral responsibility to deal with patients' refusal and try to correct the". Although it is also my personal point of view, I think "correct" is too strong… maybe would be better to "discuss"….

Please revise the English, I'm not an English speaker but the paper seems scattered from convoluted expressions. For example…Line 183-3 "CT and laboratory analyses couldn't exclude the patient from rtPA administration" should be "CT and laboratory analyses allow the patient to rtPA administration"

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?
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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.
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**Quality of written English**
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Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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