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Reviewer's report:

General
In their manuscript „The use of implantable cardioverter defibrillators in Iceland: a retrospective population based study“ the Leosdottir et al report on their 10 year single center experience of ICD implantation in Iceland. Since all ICD therapy in Iceland is performed at the University of Reykjavik the data represent ICD experience of the whole country. The patient cohort is small, is analyzed retrospectively and represents a more or less typical ICD cohort. The date shown well reflect what has been shown in larger populations. But the well written paper is of scientific worth since it gives a very thorough overview about the Iceland experience and makes it comparable to other countries. The socio-economic impact is high. The following revisions listed below have been done by the authors.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. How many devices were implanted for a primary and how many for a secondary prophylactic indication?

2. The methods of episode evaluation have to be made clearer. How many devices had stored electrograms available. Were the stored electrograms evaluated by two investigators independently?

3. The number of inappropriate ICD therapies is high (as in other studies). Were advanced detection algorithms used in the single and dual chamber devices after implantation? What other prevent strategies were used to reduce inappropriate ICD therapies?

4. Figures 2 and 3 do not really help. These numbers could better be illustrated for all patients in pie charts.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
A few spelling mistakes should be corrected

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
none

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: No
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