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**Reviewer's report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions

to me it is still unclear, how the follow-up was performed and how many patients were lost to follow-up. I would recommend to insert this information in the method section and to resubmit

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract results:
„Didn’t“ is not appropriate
„Kaplan-meier“ typo

Introduction
Well written.

Methods:
Major question:
Methods: To me, it is still unclear how the follow-up during the five year period was done: yearly visiting, telephone interview or based on registry of the government? How many percent of patients were lost to follow-up?

Result and discussion: appropriate

Graphs:
I could not find the legends. Time axis: should be better specified: probably days?

In summary:
The main value of the manuscript is the long follow-up of patients with different types of stroke. Especially, data of hemorrhagic stroke and SAH are lacking for a so long period. However, beside other limitations, to me it is still unclear, how the follow-up was performed and how many patients were lost to follow-up. I would recommend to insert this information in the method section and to resubmit.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes, it is.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Not yet described sufficiently, still unclear, how the follow-up was performed and how many patients were lost to follow-up.

3. Are the data sound? Depends on the methods, see above. Additionally, there might be a bias because not all stroke were included.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes, in the recent version ethical statement is included.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes. The limitation are discussed.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes, they do.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes, they do.

9. Is the writing acceptable? Some typos, style needs minor correction such as „did not“ instead of „didn’t“

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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