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Reviewer's report:

General
The authors conducted a study to assess awareness of stroke warning signs, risk factors and perceived risk among at risk patients in Oman. The findings suggest that awareness is relatively low, particularly in specific sub groups. The manuscript is well written and will add to the literature on this topic.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

In the methods section, it would be useful for the authors to describe how the eligible population was identified? how many total eligible patients there were during the time period, and the characteristics of this population compared to the sample that agreed to participate. Were they similar? Different? (e.g., age, sex, prevalence of TIA, etc ...)

For the questions related to stroke warning signs and potential risk factors, were aided (e.g., a list of possible warning signs was described and then the patient indicates yes, no, or dont know) or unaided questions used (e.g., the patients were asked what are the warning signs for stroke)?

Table 1 could be removed and the findings described in the text of the results section.

In the discussion section, there are no comment made about the limitations of this study. The authors should include a brief paragraph describing the limitations.

The authors should also consider adding some comments to the discussion regarding how to deliver the messages regarding stroke warning signs, and stroke prevention in this population. What are potentially effective means to do this, particularly in light of the cultural beliefs and traditional healing.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

In the first paragraph of the results section, third sentence, the word "were" should be deleted.

In Table 4, it is unclear what "false beliefs" means.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare I have no competing interests.