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Reviewer's report:

I have read the manuscript for several times now. Although the authors have clearly attempted to address most of the reviewers’ concerns in their revised version, the manuscript still does not stand at the level deemed suitable for original contribution by this reviewer. The reasons are several, most importantly these findings are not novel and the manuscript is not coherent in presentation and lacks a well-developed hypothesis.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

* The manuscript is lengthy, many times redundant (for example, sample size is reported 3 times in Methods), not well organized and the writing is wordy and needs improvement.
* The title of the paper does not match the findings. I am still not convinced that the associations differ between MI and UAP. Moreover, MI is obviously less prone to misclassification than UAP, possibly affecting the observed coefficients.
* The Abstract’s conclusion is ambiguous.
* The number of references should be cut down by half. For example, why should one use 16 references to state that lifestyle factors have been linked to CHD risk?
* The manuscript should focus on a single, more developed hypothesis (currently there are just too many, eg, different CHD entities, various risk factors, family history, gender, etc).
* The 43% study response rate should be discussed.
* P. 15 "The results in this prospective study are probably not influenced by selection or information bias"... This should be definitely removed.
* p. 16 "Furthermore, this misclassification would have attenuated the differences in effects between AMI and UAP". Again, I disagree.
* Tables should be cut down in number and presented in a more effective and interpretable manner.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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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