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Reviewer's report:

Authors surveyed the status of FD among Malays with an officially and properly translated Malay version of the Rome III questionnaire. All process looked quite reliable and this report shows us the status of FD among local Malays with very low H. pylori infection.

Several minor points need to be answered and discussed accordingly.

1. “Of those married subjects, females were more likely to have FD and psychosocial symptoms than men (6.3% vs. 0.6%), P = 0.05.” P=0.05 does not mean a significant difference. P value should be LESS than 0.05 to be significant.

2. 10% of the subjects had FD. Can this be expressed as “common”?

3. Expressions like “more common than previously expected” or so may be better.

4. The word “satiation” is used instead of “satiety” in Rome III.

5. Diagnosis of H. pylori infection was based on CLO and/or histologic examination of mucosal biopsy specimen from body and/or antrum. Results from one specimen may be different from those from two specimens. All H. pylori tests should have been done with specimens from two sites to ensure the proper reliability of the results.

6. What will you say if a patient has H. pylori infection with symptoms compatible with FD? Will you exclude the case from FD? This point need to be discussed.

7. Multivariable logistic regression is usually done using those variables which are shown to be significant from univariable regression. According to the description, this study used all variables in multivariable analysis regardless of their significance from univariable analysis.

8. “The married females with FD commonly reported EPS rather than overlap between EPS and PDS (7 vs. 3 subjects).” Was this a significant difference from other patients? It seems NOT.

9. “In the current study, patients with FD had significantly greater BMI than those
patients without FD.” Higher BMI was significant only from univariable analysis and not from multivariable analysis. Therefore, it might not have a clinical significance.

10. Several mistypings are noted and need to be corrected.
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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