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Author's response to reviews: see over
Answer to reviewer 1

1. “The introduction needs more background information, such as the number of people seeking help with stroke symptoms in Italy”

Comment: a paragraph on the epidemiology of stroke in Italy has been added to the introduction, to represent the relevance of the problem addressed in our paper, that is the low level of public awareness of a very frequent disease, which is expected to increase in incidence in the next few years, in Italy as in any high-income countries.

2. ……”I don’t have any grasp as to the percentage or how much of the document was improved upon by this technique compared with a direct translation /usual practice. I feel the addition of a control group using the usual practice would clearly show how this strategy

Comment: Our work is based on the assumption that, to adapt a questionnaire for use in a cultural setting that is different from that of the derivation cohort, it is inappropriate to simply translate and use it (Gjersing et al, BMC Med Res Methodol 2010, 10:13). There is general agreement on this assumption, so we did not included a control group. However, we agree that this point is worth being mentioned, especially for readers who are not familiar with the topic of cross-cultural adaptation of research instruments, and the discussion has been integrated accordingly.

3. The conclusions and discussion sections merits more work, namely to add more to what this hopes to achieve. The authors have not discussed the limitations of their work and what is original about their approach to problems involving public education.

We willingly accepted the reviewer’s suggestion about the need to discuss in more details the potential impact of our work as well as its limitations.
To this aim, the discussion has been modified by adding considerations about the strengths and limitations of the study.
Answer to Reviewer 2

1. “My only recommendation for major revision is that the paper could be significantly shortened by showing more of the data in tables”

Comment.
As suggested, we have reduced the result paragraphs, and added a table displaying the items that required some kind of revision with notes about the Committee’s final decisions. Furthermore, the cohort description and the statement about the percentages of the alternative answers (calling doctor, etc.) were eliminated.

In addition, the cohort description and the statement about the percentages of the alternative answers (calling doctor, etc.) were eliminated.

2. “There is a critical typo on P. 3, "calling 991". I wonder if the test subject would be marked wrong if they said that they would dial that number”.

We thank the reviewer for pointing out the typo, which we have corrected.