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Reviewer’s report:

1- Your study is interesting because stroke’s management issues in caregiving it is an important and less explored question in Pakistan. However, you should appraise more it organizing better its sessions.

2- This study has been carried out in conformity with the ethical standards of the field.

3- Figures are well-done (Fig. 1 and 2).

4- Discussion interprets the results in light of previous researches (Discussion, par.4).

5- Conclusions are justified (Conclusion, par.4).

• Major Compulsory Revisions

6- You could shift the paragraph from line 22 to line 28 above the paragraph from line 12 to 17, because it could be better if you introduce a word’s overview and then the Pakistan’s prevalence of the disease. Moreover, you could join paragraph from line 19 to line 20 and paragraph from line 30 to 32, connecting the caregiver’s major financial burden to the community’s major financial burden (Background, par.1).

7- Could you report more studies carried out about stroke’s caregivers to support your thesis? You could report them in paragraphs from lines 34 to 42.

8- Could you find another key word? You could not write both “stroke” and “stroke survivors”.

9- You should indicate the research design adopted and formal design features of your study (Materials and methods, par.2).

10- Can you explain better the statistical analysis, please? You should create a dedicated space in your paper (Materials and methods, par.2).

11- You could explain why you chose this instrument (Materials and methods, par.2), i.e. jointing lines 156-158.

12- Part from line 50 to 59 could be better introduced and you may explain your hypothesis (Materials and methods, par.2).

13- Every section of the abstract is characterized in a precisely way and it reflects the findings. Nevertheless, some information are missing: i.e. research design; justification of your purpose could be better explained.
14- You should report a subsection about the limitations of your study.

• Minor Essential Revisions

15- The question posed could be defined in a better way, although the background introduces it in an appropriate context. The purposes of the study are clear (Background, par.1).

16- You could associate in a better and logical way paragraphs from line 34 to 42 with the above part, in order to have a more fluid question (Background, par.1).

17- References aren’t in APA’s Style: citation by name and year can be given in parentheses or by citing the year in parentheses after an author’s name used in the text. You can find an explanation and some examples in BMC Psychology site:
http://www.biomedcentral.com/bmcpsychol/authors/instructions/researcharticle#figs_file_formats

18- Some sections are necessary because other researchers who work in the same field can reproduce it. You could introduce a subparagraph about Participants (Materials and methods, par.2).

19- You could also introduce a subparagraph about Procedure (Materials and methods, par.2).

20- Information about research proposal could be shifted at the beginning of the paragraph about material and methods (Materials and methods, par.2).

21- You could report everything relevant to your research question or hypotheses when you are explaining the study’s results (Results, par.3).

22- You could also provide enough details for reader to be able to draw their conclusions, before the description’s results (Results, par.3).

• Discretionary Revisions

23- Could you enumerate the paragraphs?

24- You could put a dot after the sentence “Caregivers can be considered the second victims of the disease” and introduce the other sentence with “Indeed” or “In effect” (Background, par.1).

25- The title reflects aims of the study. Could you weasel out of using two times “:”, please?

26- Each table should begin in a separate page and respect the APA’s format: you should underline the labels. You should also indicate the significance level chosen.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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