To the Editors,

We are delighted that our paper is accepted pending the small edit requested by Dr. Burch (see below). We have included both a highlighted version with changes annotated and a clean copy of the text for your review.

Editor’s Comments

1. “Many thanks for your revision, which has addressed the concerns raised by our statistician. I would be pleased to accept the paper after one small edit. The sentence “Both dabigatran and rivaroxaban demonstrated non-inferiority to warfarin for the prevention of stroke (see table A4 in appendix)” has been added to the paper. Since non-inferiority means something specific, and that was not the goal of this analysis, it might be better just to say that the event rates were not statistically significantly different or something to that effect. I understand it’s a small change but we don’t have a better mechanism for making this edit. Once this is done, I’ll be please to accept the paper. “

This has been done, as requested.

2. “I also wanted to include the rationale for the decision to place this analysis in an appendix, so that we have a formal record of it (no changes needed on your part here). I’ll just copy what I wrote to you in the email, in response to your query about how to proceed with incorporating an analysis of efficacy”.

No further changes made to text as “no (additional) changes were needed”, per Dr. Burch.