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Reviewer's report:

This is very important work but not suitable for a health services and policy journal as it is currently constituted. If the purpose is to focus results toward the importance of sustaining hyperacute stroke units the following is necessary: 1. describe the units in greater depth... 2. your trial data need to be explained in terms of the design and analysis for a health services audience. 3. combining of other data that speak to the impact of these centres is needed. I would either focus on the research centre value add or the clinical results and spend more time addressing one or the other because, in the end, its not likely that the NHS would support such centres for their research value. Who do you want to convince? The value add of these units is not convincing especially since the user profile is quite different from the control population. It feels like a clinical trial paper with a small health services orientation. Is there a health services and policy researcher as a co-author. This may help the team orient the paper more effectively.
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