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**Reviewer's report:**

**General**

========================================================================================================

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

1. For data presented in Table 2, not all p values are given in the text. For clarity all p values for all variables should be included in the table.
2. While I agree the term "association" is widely used that does not make it correct. The focus of the paper, based on the statistical analysis is to investigate if differences exist and then to investigate the relative contribution of those variables, where there were differences. The paper focus is clouded by the use of the term "causative factors" in the introduction and the way the word "association" is used in the discussion. There is a clear implication in the discussion text of relationships by the use of the word "association" and this was not tested. For example "The association found between increased BMI and CPHP" infers that as BMI increases you are more likely to get CPHP. This was not tested. What was found was the group with CPHP were heavier than the group without CPHP. The discussion needs to be worded such that it accurately reflects the results.
3. As the reliability for the six item FPI was not presented, the statement "Only those factors that could be measured using reliable and valid techniques were examined" should be removed.
4. The authors state that an adjusted p value is not required as Conclusions are based on multivariate findings. However the greater majority of the discussion is on the univariate findings and therefore the reader should be confident in these results. At this point in time given that I do not have the exact p values for each variable I cannot make an assessment as to whether the results are really due to chance related to multiple tests. The reader requires exact p values and an adjusted alpha level should be used for the univariate tests.
5. Your rationale for inclusion in the logistic regression was significance in the univariate test and, I assume, normality of distribution although this was unstated. Why was weight not included given that it was significant?

========================================================================================================

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

========================================================================================================

**Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)**

========================================================================================================

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory 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
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