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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors

This is an interesting cross sectional study on 1212 patients with chest pain. The paper need revision.

The authors concludes that the localization of chest pain is not diagnostically useful in the critical evaluation. Surprisingly none of this patient have simultaneously abdominal pain which is not uncommon in patient with ischemic heart or with less common pain syndrome (JAMA,2012;25,307:16:1746-7).

I asked to revise statistics as I am not expert with some of the methods used.

What is the definition of chest wall syndrome ? it is always important to remember to our readers definitions.

Groups are not homogeneous, and this is a strong bias in this paper.

Why patients with previously diagnosed chest pain have been excluded ?

It should be interesting to know if there exists a difference between urban and rural patients. Can you comment ?

How the psychogenic chest pain have been diagnosed by the family physician ?

The way how the panel worked is not clear because in some cases they had limited clinical data.

Minor

Page IV the methods paragraph is the AIM of the paper. The word method should go 6 lines below. Please change accordingly

The discussion apperas to me too long. Al figures should go in one page

Conclusions are not clear and on basis of the results I would suggest that I would suggest to ask other centres to confirm their findings.

What are the “other clinical characteristics” …… abdominal and chest pain, shortness of breath

thank you for sending this manuscript to BMC family practice

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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