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Reviewer's report:

General

Thank you for the revised paper and your constructive response to my comments. I think the paper is now clearer and in particular the Discussion is easier to read. I only have minor further suggestions to make.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

In the Methods section (p4) it is not clear how the Rose angina scale is used to contribute – or not – to the CHD classification. Does this “CHD” group comprise those with a self-reported heart attack (without Dr diagnosis?) and positive Rose angina?

In the Discussion section (p7 2nd paragraph) low statistical power should be mentioned when discussing lack of evidence of increased survival in later cohort.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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