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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors presented a methodological paper regarding an observational study on therapeutic strategies and management of atrial fibrillation in UK. This study is belonging to the general

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

Although it is only a methodological paper and it is a part a general study, data emerging from this study could be interesting. However I have some major concerns and the paper needs a revision.

First I think the manuscript should be shortened since the general GARFIELD methodological paper has been already published (Am Heart J 2012;163:13-19.e1)

**Background:** line 10: provide data about disability and severity of AF-strokes. Fourth paragraph and following should be reduced given the main paper published. The authors should point out about possible highlights of a second paper focused on UK reality.

**Methods:** given the other published paper, methods should be shortened highlighting the possible differences with GARFIELD general study

**Minor Essential Revisions**

The authors should also provide some preliminary data about AF in UK. A table reporting AF studies in UK could be also useful.

The authors should explain better what do they mean for ‘adapted to the UK context to maximise the value of GARFIELD to the UK’ and describe better why it is important to describe the UK reality. Last paragraph should be moved in the methods part. Aims are also not clear and should be explained better (comparison with other areas? Geographical differences in AF management).
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