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Reviewer’s report:

In general, I found this to be a well written and interesting paper. My main gripe is that it should be scaled down to be called something like ‘a preliminary (exploratory etc) study’. Your sample size is quite small, particularly as it relates to patients and relatives. That said, I think its worth publishing, but needs a revision.

- Could you help the non-medical reader by explain what is meant by ‘thrombolysis’ (I felt myself reaching for Wikipedia – never a good sign)
- In general the language and style of the paper is very medical (not surprising I suppose given the authorship), but I would have thought a more expository style might help the reader to see the real worth of what you have done – can you simplify the language – maybe give it to a non-medical person to read and then look at their comments?
- Page 4 – can you elaborate on what the ‘physician-related factors’ were
- Page 7 – ethnographic work – this would drive the my sociology friends buts – can you give more details- ethnography has a very well documented set of research methods – a little more detail might help your establish your credibility in using the term.
- Page 9, line 14 – what does ‘efficacious’ mean?
- Page 11 – delete double bracket – line 24

Another general comment – your paper makes a lot of references to work you have already published – it makes it a little too self-referential – could you find the space (I know this is tough to do given word/page lengths – to explain the relation to your other work in a little more detail