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Reviewer's report:

This study reports the results of a postal questionnaire sent to people with a diagnosis of stroke or TIA to assess their knowledge of stroke risk factors and prevention.

The topic being studied is of importance as we know that compliance with stroke secondary prevention needs improving and without a knowledgeable population it is unlikely that this will improve. The study has been conducted in an appropriate way and the analyses seem sound. The response rate of 76% is good for a postal survey and it is very helpful to have an analysis of the differences in demographics of the participants and non participants

Major revisions

1. The main weakness of the study is that the sample size is relatively small (182) and when broken down into subgroups e.g. those with a risk factor of carotid stenosis or excess alcohol this becomes a real problem. This should be acknowledged in the discussion

2. The other concern is that the sample is taken from one general practice area in Sweden and it is therefore difficult to know how representative the data are of the national or international picture. This problem could be mitigated if there was a more detailed presentation of findings from previous similar studies in the discussion.

3. The supplemental file submitted with the paper contains important information and should I think be published with the paper. However it is not clear to me whether the risk factors that the patients thought they had were actually risk factors that had been recorded objectively in the medical records. If these data are available then it would be worth including these in the table.

Minor points

1. Page 10 the words ‘subheading for this section’ seem out of place after the first paragraph;
2. Reference 24 should I think be Hacke and not Hack
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