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Author's response to reviews: see over
I am pleased with the way authors have dealt with the comments. I have no more substantial comments, and only a suggestion for the discussion section below.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

As authors mention, one of the limitations of this study is methodological differences between surveys. In relation to this, differences in the definition of stroke between survey should also be mentioned. For instance, the higher prevalence of stroke in El prat could be also partly due to the fact that this survey included TIAs as part of the definition of stroke, whereas many others would not. This is unlikely to explain the pattern itself, but my contribute to it.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Dear Sir.: 

We are grateful for your nice considerations and interesting suggestion, but in our study we only have considered stroke, never TIA has been included, though it appears as a distinct category in clinical classification in some surveys. The fact that TIA was studied does not imply pooling prevalence figures. In order to avoid possible misunderstandings we have clarified it in two cells for diagnostic criteria in table 1.

We expect that you consider that the process of review has ended in a satisfactory way.

Yours sincerely,

R. Boix