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Reviewer’s report:

I authors report a new analysis of the ACROSS-China study. The topic is important, relatively innovative and the findings are interesting.

SEVERAL MINOR REVISIONS:

In the abstract
1.- I do not understand the last sentence of the conclusion: “significant to secondary stroke prevention” Maybe not appropriate for the results of the study.

In the Introduction section:
2.- “Although the sensitivity of HbA1c for detecting DM was not as high as that of OGTT, HbA1c was recommended as a method to screen for DM by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) because its low sensitivity was offset by its advantages of familiarity to clinician, simple manipulation, and without requiring the patient to fast, etc.” Does not read well.

Maybe try: “HbA1c is an easy method to screen for DM but compared to OGTT, its sensitivity for detecting DM is low. However, the ADA endorses the use of HbA1C based on its familiarity to clinicians, simple manipulation, and no need to fast.”

3.- Define FPG and OGTT early in the introduction.

4.- Could you shorten the introduction? There are some redundancies

Discussion:
5.- I’d like the authors to comment on the limitations of OOGT as the gold standard. In the ACROSS-China study OOGT was performed within 2 weeks of the acute stroke. Patients were also given medications in the hospitals. These 2 factors can effect the results of the test.

6.- Please delete:

“In short, HbA1c combined with FPG for diagnosing DM was recommended in
acute ischemic stroke patients without previous DM.”
And
“Based on our results, we recommend the use of HbA1C as pre-diabetes screening tool in acute ischemic stroke patients.”
You might use:
Our results advocate the use of HbA1C as screening tool for the diagnosis of pre-diabetes.
6.- The clinical significant paragraph can be deleted or shorten.
7.- Please improve the English grammar and flow of the manuscript.
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