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Reviewer's report:

Authors have made an excellent job addressing the comments of all reviewers, and I am please with the way they have dealt with all recommendations. At this point, I only have a few specific comments that might slightly improve the final version of the manuscript:

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Final conclusion of abstract and of the paper: According to table 3, both FAI and occupation (at the highest level) remain associated with stroke prevalence after full adjustment. Please re-state the conclusions to make this clearer, because at the moment it appears as if only FAI remains related.

2. The final conclusion stating “FAI could be used as a valuable index of SES for health studies in China” does not have directly to do with the results of this study. The fact that there is a positive association between FAI and stroke does not mean that it is a good indicator. I would suggest to limit your conclusions to those related to stroke, and perhaps focus on a more public health related final conclusion.

3. In discussing table 4 (page 12, 1st paragraph), authors state that the associations between FAI and stroke are restricted to certain sub-groups. I wonder to what extent it is possible to make this statement, given that cell numbers are very small making interpretation difficult. For example, among those living in rural areas, there was only 1 case of stroke among the high FAI group; similarly, for those aged 35-49, there were only 2 strokes in the high FAI group. I think these conclusions are very susceptible to random variable, and I would suggest not drawing too strong conclusions. At least, when discussing the results, please specify that numbers were small and confidence intervals were wide.

4. The lack of an association between income and stroke at ages 50-64 could reflect the fact that this group has already suffered a sort of transition, so that the positive association in the cohort aged 65+ is not observed anymore among the younger ages. These cohorts effect are interesting and may explain why the positive associations are restricted to the older cohorts. Consider mentioning this in the discussion.

5. Table 3 legends: In describing Model 3, the sentence ends in “…, and.”
**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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