

Reviewer's report

Title: Risk Factors for Ischemic Stroke; Results of 9 Years Follow-up in a Middle East cohort

Version: 1 **Date:** 19 July 2012

Reviewer: M. Arfan Ikram

Reviewer's report:

This is an important manuscript that investigates stroke risk factors in an Iranian population. Given the scarce data on this topic, I believe the data are an important contribution to the literature. The authors have performed a well-designed study with proper statistics.

There are a few comments, though, that I invite the authors to consider:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

- the authors should specify how they diagnosed the subtype of ischemic stroke.
- The presentation of Tables need to be optimized. Table 1 in its current format implies that the study was a case-cohort, which it is not. The authors should present the characteristics of the whole population together, or if anything for men and women separately.
- In Tables 2 and 3, the associations for non-significant risk factors should also be shown.
- I gather that the source study was designed as a trial. What was the intervention? How many people in the current analysis were in the intervention group? The authors should state more clearly the trial-origin of this sample.
- I understand the use of categorization in the various variables to calculate PAR. However, to fully appreciate the data (also from a public health perspective) the authors should also provide associations using the continuous variables.

Minor Essential Revisions:

- The authors present their sample as Middle Eastern, which is true; however, even in the Middle East there are many ethnicities. It is best to be even more accurate and mention Iranian throughout the paper.
- On page 7, the authors mention "incident CKD". This should be "prevalent CKD"
- The authors should explain what they mean with "verbal autopsy"?
- in the limitations, I miss the "second" limitation.

- 69 cases of stroke/minor stroke/TIA is rather low for 9 years follow-up. The authors should expand more on what could be possible explanations.

Discretionary Revisions:

- Are there data on atrial fibrillation?

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.

Declaration of competing interests:

I have no conflicts of interest pertaining to the review of this manuscript.