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Reviewer's report:

The authors provide a revised manuscript detailing their experiences with PSM in a single center in Spain. Although I was not a reviewer for the original submission I have reviewed the authors responses to the original review and it appears that they have adequately addressed the issues raised. I found this to be an informative description of their PSM experience that will be helpful to others interested in expanding PSM within their health systems. Some additional comments for consideration:

- Anti-vitamin K (A VK) is a somewhat non-traditional abbreviation. I have generally seen the abbreviation as vitamin K antagonist (VKA). This is a very minor point and one that the authors don't need to change if they are more comfortable with AVK.
- In the abstract conclusion consider omitting "compared with conventional model of care of AVK drugs and direct oral anticoagulants" as PSM was not actually compared to these other strategies in this study.
- In the first two paragraphs there are no citations for any statements–this seems inadequate for a scientific report.
- In the methods there is a paragraph beginning with "A total of 1,380 patients..." These are results and should probably be moved to the results section.
- In the results if reporting median age, IQR would perhaps be a better indicator of data spread than standard deviation.
- Patients with VTE are referred to as having "recurrent VTE". Had patients actually had recurrences or were they being treated to prevent a first recurrence after an initial event?
- On page 8 the word "traumatism" is used. "Trauma" would probably be a better word here.
- Would limit conclusions to those directly observed in your study. The long discussion with comparison to other studies should appear in the discussion but not in the conclusion.

Table 1: Not a very informative way to report on comorbidities (ie, any vs. >3). Would be better to list them out individually if you have this level of detail. I defer to the judgement of the editorial staff on this issue but it would be nice to know what type of comorbidities were present.

Table 3.1, 3.2, 3.3: Defer to the editorial staff on whether you want to invest the time and resources to include these tables but they are massive and I'm not sure the information provided adds much to the manuscript. My opinion is not many readers are going to invest the energy required to review these tables in any detail.
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