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Reviewer's report:

Comments to Bösner et al: Gender differences in presentation, course, and diagnosis of chest pain in primary care.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   It is not totally clear from the methods which results are use to base the final conclusions upon. From the results, I suppose it is the significant variables after multivariate analysis. However, the authors also present LRs, which could suggest that these are the main results. Please clarify. (minor)
   Second last line: I suppose this is the p-value for removal of variables from the initial model. Correct? (minor)

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes. A quick reader may suppose to find diagnostic information, quod non. However, the authors clearly indicate what can be expected or not.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes

Additional comments:
The part on follow-up (results on page 8) is interesting, but not really necessary for this paper. I would suggest the authors to drop it from this manuscript and to further analyze this in more detail for a next paper. (discretionary)

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests