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Manuscript 3497237314206882, entitled: ‘Differences in patient outcomes and chronic care management of oral anticoagulant therapy: an explorative study’.

Dear professor Thomas Rosemann,

On behalf of my co-authors, I am submitting the revised manuscript ‘Differences in patient outcomes and chronic care management of oral anticoagulant therapy: an explorative study’ for publication in the BMC Health Services Research. We like to thank the reviewers for their comments to improve the manuscript. We have adapted the manuscript according to the comments from the review process.

Thank you for considering our manuscript for publication in your journal. We are delighted that you have accepted the manuscript in principal. We look forward to your final decision.

Yours sincerely,

Hanneke Drewes
Reviewer: 1

Reviewer's report

Title: Differences in patient outcomes and chronic care management for oral anticoagulant therapy: an explorative study

Version: 2  Date: 25 November 2010

Reviewer: Hanna Kaduszkiewicz

Reviewer's report:
The authors have revised the manuscript carefully according to the comments.
I have only two remarks left, then in my opinion the manuscript is ready for publication.

1. Abstract, Results:
I'm afraid there is something wrong with the sentence:
"The association between the patient outcomes was significantly associated with patient orientation and the number of specialized nurses versus doctors (p-value < 0.05)." In my opinion it should be: „Patient outcomes were significantly associated with patient orientation and ....“

The reviewer is fully correct. The sentence is rephrased as proposed by the reviewer.

2. Discussion, Limitations:
I still do not understand the last part of the rephrased limitation on page 14 starting after the brackets:
“Next, the highly developed documentation of the ACs on national level is in contrast with the scarcely developed documentation in the clinical setting. As a consequence, gaps exist in the follow-up of patients (e.g. INR values around hospitalization) which could reveal more insight in the influence of chronic care management on the quality of care.”

I do understand that an evaluation of follow-up gaps could give insight into areas for quality improvement outside the ACs (or maybe in cooperation with ACs). But this was not the aim of this study. Maybe the limitation you mean is the following: “As a consequence, gaps exist in the follow-up of patients (e.g. INR values around hospitalization). These gaps could not be analysed and controlled for. Thus they may have affected the association between patient outcomes and elements of the chronic care model under study.”

We appreciate the suggestion considering the rephrased limitation which indeed improves the explanation of our intended limitation. We have rephrased the limitation as suggested by the reviewer.

Level of interest:
An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English:
Acceptable

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**
*I declare that I have no competing interests.*
Reviewer 2
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Version: 2 Date: 12 November 2010
Reviewer: Juan Carlos Souto

Reviewer's report:
I agree with the revised version
Minor essential revision:
The Dutch abbreviation TD (for AC) still appears once in each Table (1 and 2). Please, change it to AC

The reviewer is fully correct. The abbreviations are mistakenly used. We have inserted the right abbreviations in table 1 and 2.
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