Reviewer's report

Title: Prevalence and prognosis of non-specific chest pain among patients hospitalized for acute coronary syndrome - a systematic literature search

Version: 2 Date: 8 April 2012

Reviewer: mohammed justin zaman

Reviewer's report:

Re-review for BMC Medicine on: Incidence and prognosis of non-specific chest pain among patients recruited from consecutive series of hospitalizations for acute coronary syndrome

I re-read the paper again from the top.

Abstract:
The authors write: ‘NSCP patients represent a large and important group. Although their average one-year mortality rate was almost 6 times lower than those with “high risk ACS”, the subset with concomitant CHD had a relatively poor prognosis’ - relative poor prognosis compared to whom?

Paper:
Otherwise, the paper is hugely improved! I like the first paragraph of the discussion which summarises things very well. In particular, the line ‘The rates of readmissions were high, reflecting the significant burden of health costs represented by these patients’ is important.

In the conclusions, the line ‘The remaining patients may be offered a comprehensive non-cardiac evaluation of their symptoms’ is also an important addition – though these patients with NSCP might have high morbidity (e.g. recurrent admissions), that might be improved by focussing away from the heart and more on other causes of their pain. Perhaps the authors might add a line or two in the discussion to this effect, as if a patient is simply reassured and discharged because their troponin was negative, given a lack of explanation they will simply come back again the next time they get pain in order to have a troponin done.

These are all minor essential revisions.
The paper also had a much higher standard of English.
Overall, an important subject, and the paper will generate a lot of debate I hope!

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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