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Reviewer's report:

This is an important topic with the secondary prevention of stroke or TIA remaining sub optimal. The authors have designed and administered a postal questionnaire to 240 primary care patients who had suffered at least one stroke or TIA. They also collected data from the patients' medical records. The questionnaire appears to be soundly designed and they had a good response rate of (76%).

* Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The standard of writing would be greatly improved by some careful editing. The text also needs to be reduced and there is often repetition between what is in the tables and in the text. The manuscript reads more like a report than a journal article and needs to be considerably improved.

2. Reading the background it appears that there are already many studies on this topic. The authors need to make the case for conducting their study and demonstrate what evidence gap they will fill by their results.

4.1 Study population. Two sources of participants are described: the medical records at GPHCC and the stroke register. However, later in the paragraph they say there were three sources. What was the third?

4.2 Study population. What time frame was used? All that is stated here is that patients were selected if they had a diagnosis by 1st May 2006. How far back did they go? Were they selecting first stroke? In addition in Figure 1 they state that 20 patients who had a diagnosis of stroke after 1st May 2005 were excluded. This needs to be clarified in the text and the figure.

* Minor Essential Revisions

5. The referencing is not conventional. Reference 14 appears before references 8-13.

6. It is not clear how the figures in Table 1 and in the text match up.

7. Table 2. The response categories do not need to be in the sub-title as well as in the table.

8. At the end of the section on non-responders there is a sentence which reads: “Sub-heading for this section.” This needs to be removed.

9. An important finding was that patients who had participated in at least one
group meeting designed to provide information about risk factors for stroke were no better informed than those who had not attended. No information is given about the content of format of these annual meetings which may be useful for readers designing education on risk factors.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**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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