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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1) The authors do not make it clear how this project, both in the introduction as well as the discussion, is relevant to a Family Medicine audience. How should this population of reader use the information provided by this project in their practice?

Minor Essential Revisions:
1) The Objective of the study as well as the method contains a few contradictions in tense (past vs. future). These should be addressed & corrected.
2) I would suggest stating in the title that this data is representative of a United States population only.
3) I would suggest including a few search terms in the 1st paragraph of the Methods section to give readers an idea of those used in the search. They can be referred to the appendix for a more detailed description.
4) Page 10, "Results of Meta-Analysis", 1st paragraph, Line 9: The sentence beginning "While age per 10-year increase..." is a fragment.
5) Page 13, 2nd paragraph: What data, either from the current study or the medical literature, supports the text regarding age and stroke risk?
6) Page 14, 2nd paragraph, 3rd line: The author of reference #55 should be "Fang and colleagues" rather than "Wang and colleagues".
7) I would recommend adding 2 additional limitations to the paper: A) Did you look at differences in predictors between valvular & non-valvular atrial fibrillation? B) I would recommend mentioning the fact that this information is representative of practice in the US and may not be applicable to other countries.
8) Reference #49 is missing the names of the authors of this paper.
9) Figure 1: Provide reference numbers for both Hylek 1996 and the 2001 Guideline Update that are provided in the footnote.

Discretionary Revisions:
1) Somewhere in the methods section, I would recommend defining the term "ideal candidate".

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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