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Reviewer's report:

Following you can find the text with my comments and the advice on manuscript acceptability:

1. Will the study design adequately test the hypothesis?

The manuscript presents the protocol of a series of sequential studies. The study design is quite complex and is divided into three series in which patients with optimal TTR and those with low quality TTR will be studied to assess their perception of the disease, quality of life and expectations from therapy (in particular in relation to NOACs). Data from several questionnaires and those on the adherence detected in patients with TTR less than 50% will be used for the final phase of the study aimed at evaluating interventions to improve adherence.

2. Are sufficient details provided to allow replication of the work or comparison with related analyses: if not, what is missing?

Details of the study are generally well reported but the choice of the TTR threshold less than 50% appears to be rather unclear if we consider that TTR values slightly below 60% already involve a problematic efficacy of therapy with VKAs. Authors must somehow justify the choice of such a TTR threshold.

The selection of patients is also crucial for this kind of studies. Those who agree to be enrolled, have a very different attitude to get involved and then to show adherence than those who do not. This is true both for patients with good quality of TTR and for those with low. The authors do not report the details of the policy of enrollment nor say much about any information on patients who requested to participate, may refuse to accept.

3. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition: if not, in what ways?

Yes

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?

This item is not relevant to the kind of submitted manuscript

5. Is the writing acceptable?

Yes, although some spelling errors (ie Rosendal instead of Rosendaal, line 152) should be corrected.