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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. The question to be addressed was phrased “…we aimed to know the behavior of effects of secondary prevention in our population…”, but this aim is not addressed by the analyses in the presented paper.
2. It is not clear why no multivariate analyses were performed, e.g. to adjust for age and sex.
3. I could not find a description of patients lost-to-follow-up/censored data.
4. Kaplan-Meier estimates the probability for survival, not risk of death. Table 2: please describe how the risk % was calculated (1-Kaplan-Meier estimate). Table 2 title should be rephrased accordingly.
5. Were no strokes of unknown cause observed?
6. Table 2, second column: shouldn’t the number of risk be 319 instead of 338?
7. Figure 1: I would suggest to restructure this figure. The box “3 year follow-up” should not be included in the flow chart. “136 deaths” might better be placed in 2 boxes below the boxes “372 free of new events” and “35 recurrent events”, respectively.

Minor Essential Revisions
8. The reference list seems to be incomplete. Please check carefully for correctness and completeness.
9. The paper should carefully be proofread for typing errors and expressions (e.g. “big killer”; line 42: did you mean “varied” instead of “ranged”?)

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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