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Reviewer's report:

General
The paper by Mohammed Al Shafaee et al. address an important issue with their paper about "perception of stroke and knowledge of potential risk factors among Omani patients at increased risk of stroke." However, major revision is needed in some parts of the paper.

Abstract:
· Only descriptive results are presented. Why do the authors not summarize the results of the multivariate analyses?
· The number of patients belong to the result section.
· The English needs some revision, for example, do not begin sentences with percentages. What does viz. mean?

Introduction:
The authors write that increased knowledge translates into improved prevention. However, the evidence on this issue is inconsistent and should be acknowledged comprehensively. The last paragraph belongs to the discussion section.

Method section:
What type of questions did the authors use (open- or close-ended questions)?

Result section:
- The result section is far too long. There are some parts which would have been clearer in tables such as percentages and numbers, for example, the prevalence of risk factors etc.
- There is no need to report univariate analyses in addition to multivariate analyses.
- What variables were entered into the models? Only age, sex and education or others as well?
- Tables: there are unexplained abbreviations (use as few as possible) and some of the tables need formatting.
- Use the same table format throughout the result section.

Discussion section:
A limitation section is needed.

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

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

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)