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General

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

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

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

I think the title should be changed, instead of 'unexplained chest pain', perhaps 'non-cardiac chest pain' would be better and this would need to be changed throughout the manuscript.

ABSTRACT

Method
The design was cross-sectional, explorative and correlational means nothing.

Results
There are essentially no results in this section, please add.

BACKGROUND

Paragraph 1
Please add ref after sentence 1: Eslick GD, Talley NJ. Non-cardiac chest pain: predictors of health care seeking, the types of health care professional consulted, work absenteeism, and interruption of daily activities. Alimentary Pharmacology and Therapeutics 2004;20:909-915.

The authors must provide more information regarding the studies mentioned in the introduction, including sample size, results and limitations of each study.

METHOD
The design was cross-sectional.

Please use a 0 in front of correlations (e.g., 0.77, not .77).

Statistical analysis
Should be <0.05.

RESULTS
Please report odds ratios for the multivariate analysis.

DISCUSSION
It is not acceptable to compare your sample with that of other studies (Paragraph 1, sentence 2).

Greater detail is required about other studies mentioned in this section (as per introduction).

Implications for clinical practice
Paragraph 1
This section needs to be expanded.

Paragraph 2
This was not mentioned previously?!!

REFERENCES
Typo ref 30 and 36.

TABLES 1, 2, 3.
Must have exact p-values and don't use ns.

TABLE 4 can be removed.

TABLE 5.
Please report odds ratios.

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
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