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**Reviewer’s report:**

In this work, Thompson et al. reviewed the available scores for prediction of stroke recurrence (or myocardial infarction after stroke) and meta-analyzed their performance. Also, they compared their performance to an informal clinicians’ prediction in the Edinburgh Stroke Study.

The results are straightforward (and expected). The currently available prognostic scores for stroke recurrence do not perform so well, at least not better than clinicians’ judgment. The authors performed a methodologically sound analysis. They also discuss the reasons which explain why these prognostic scores for stroke recurrence do not perform so well.

My only comment concerns the comparison of the scores’ performance with the clinicians’ judgment. The authors need to give more details about this e.g. how many clinicians were studied, how many patient cases, how many cases per physician, what was their background (stroke physicians? GPs? Geriatrists? Internists? Neurologists? Primary care physicians?), etc.... I guess the conclusion of the analysis would be different if the clinicians were stroke specialists compared to if they were GPs. This needs to be described in details in the methods and results sections.
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