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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study with some useful and informative data.

Specific points:

1. line 115. I am not sure why a Poisson generalised model was used to analyse time in therapeutic range. The authors need to justify this. Analysing the means using a weighted regression approach would seem more straightforward.

2. lines 137-141. Because the sample sizes for cardiology and other specialities are so much smaller than for PCP the power to detect a trend is much less. Thus I am not sure it is that helpful to quote non significant results for the smaller groups.

3. The improvements through the study are quite possibly due to the changes that have been instituted. However it could be that the non compliant unstable patients have been moved off warfarin onto other anticoagulants and that the improvements in for example, ADR rate are due to that. This possibility should be mentioned in the discussion.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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