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Reviewer's report:

Authors reported the results of a prespecified imaging substudy of the CHANCE trial. The rate of stroke recurrence was 7.6%, 15.1% and 15.3% in lacunar infarction of SAI, non-lacunar infarction of SAI and MAIs at one year, respectively. Then, authors concluded that "we should not only concern about the number of infarctions, but also the size and location of infarction in order to predict the risk of stroke recurrence in minor stroke".

Major

K-M curves in Figure 2 are very interesting. Steep rise in stroke recurrence rate within one month was observed in all 3 types of infarction. After 3 months, the K-M curves showed almost plateau. Definition of outcome event is very important to evaluate their results. However, quite simple descriptions of definition were found in the method section such as "the outcome event was stroke recurrence (ischemic or hemorrhagic) during one-year follow-up". This reviewer believed progressing stroke is one of the important manifestations of non-cardioembolic stroke. Authors should concretely describe the definition of outcome events and how to differentiate progression of symptoms from recurrent ischemic events.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
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