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Reviewer's report:

Dr. Tramacere and colleagues performed a systematic review and network meta-analysis on the comparison of statins for secondary prevention in patients with ischemic stroke or transient ischemic attack.

The relative efficacy and safety of various statins is unknown and the authors tried to summarize the current evidence. Primary outcomes were all-cause mortality and all strokes (ischemic or hemorrhagic). Secondary outcomes were ischemic stroke, ischemic stroke or TIA, hemorrhagic stroke, cardiovascular event and rhabdomyolysis, myalgia or rise in creatine kinase (CK).

Strengths of the study:

The systematic review was conducted following a strong methodology and the protocol was registered.

Suggestions to improve the study:

- As the primary outcomes are all-cause mortality and all strokes, the authors should report both outcomes first and focus on them in the abstract, discussion and conclusion, even if the results are non-significant.

- The authors stated that in three trials the lipid-lowering drug was compared to usual care, in the remaining to placebo. In order to interpret the study results, the treatments provided in the "usual care" and placebo arms should be clarified.

- One study had a very short follow up (5 - 14 days). I wander if such a short follow-up allows to assess the study outcomes and I would suggest not to include this study.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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