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Reviewer's report:

General
This paper is interesting because it deals with a very common problem in the clinical practise.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
I have no major points to be addressed to the authors.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Even though the guidlines on atrial fibrillation were not available when the authors planned their work I suggest to mention them (JACC, August 2006)in the discussion. The criteria reported there are a bit different from those adopted by ACCP.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
It would be interesting to know where patients with atrial fibrillation have been sent for monitoring thier treatment (General Practitioner, Anticoagulation clinics, other. The opinion of the authors would also be interesting to be briefly reported.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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