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**Reviewer's report:**

It was very difficult to obtain reviewers for your manuscript so I provided a review myself.

The approach taken was not hypothesis driven and the rationale and specifics of the study question were not well defined.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

The paper should be much shorter. Much of the text is devoted to issues that are not directly related to the questions at hand. The first 2 paragraphs of the background should be deleted. The second paragraph on page 5 should be eliminated or greatly reduced to focus only on the selection of which OAC agent.

Avoid editorializing and commenting on the general pros and cons of the different OACs (like sentence 1 of the discussion) and focus only on explaining the findings you observed.

Do not use the word novel. These are newer anticoagulants but they are not novel because there are several of them (there are more than one direct thrombin inhibitors too, just not marketed due to safety reasons).

**Minor Essential Revisions**

Mention that newer work is needed to understand how providers select among the different newer OACs.

Abstract: the last sentence of the conclusion does not follow from the abstract and should be deleted.

Page 8 methods: separate the 3 prescriber categories with commas.

Page 10: explain how age was used in the models.

Page 15: cite the “most recent guidelines” you are referring that reference dabigatran to or omit this statement.

Page 16 second paragraph does not make sense and needs to be fixed. Why
would 70% of patients being in PPO influence the likelihood of receiving dabigatran? Sentence “According to the Kaiser Family… doesn’t make sense.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

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

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