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Reviewer's report:

I'm very interested in your article and am looking forward to understanding your results. However, as I went through the article I found it somewhat difficult to follow due to the level of English. The topic is interesting; however, the authors should simplify the work to facilitate the reader.

Background

The sentence "We therefore postulated NYHA class to be a simple but comprehensive and efficient indicator of disease severity which can independently be utilized in analysis." should be shifted in the discussion section.

The sentence "Through all these analyses, we hoped to deepen the understanding of emotional symptoms in CHD patients" should be rewritten to explain the aim of the study better.

Methods

-Page 4, line 25: Please explain the modality of choosing of patient (inclusion and exclusion criteria) better. How do the authors define the first diagnosis of CHD? I understand that there are 443 people in the study only after seeing the Figure lecture but in the text it is very difficult to understand why. Please clarify the design of the study. Moreover, are the questionnaires administered validated in the Chinese language?

-Page 5, line 1, Braunwald criteria: a citation must be included.

-Page 5, line 11 (... in the definition of NYHA classes[23] sound a little vague, it does offer convenience for physicians the first time to get the whole picture..) The limits of this classification, if necessary, should be indicated in discussion section.

-Page 5, line 15 New York Heart Association classification: please simplify the paragraph, it not necessary to indicate the researcher's names, but only the way it was classified.

-Page 6. "Somatic and cognitive depressive symptoms" paragraph should be simplified. Is not necessary to report all the results in the text, they are already in the Table (is clearer.).
Page 6, line 59. Re-define the anxiety severity score as reported in Table 4 better (I think that a non anxious person is 0-4, is correct?). Again, the categories used should be uniform within the text.

Page 7 The first sentence should be shifted to the start of the Methods (is a selection criteria, I think… and added to inclusion and exclusion criteria) and merged with the definition on page 4 line 51 (I think that deep the same concern) The results present in the statistical analysis chapter should be moved to the result section. Moreover, in this section it is not necessary to refer to the Tables

Results

Page 9, line 6 Please verify the percentage (i.e I think is 3.4% instead 4.5%) The classification of depressed and anxiety subjects are not uniform throughout the paper. It should be better explained in the Methods section).

Page 10, line 1. This sentence is not clear. The authors are reporting the comparison of anxious people vs non-anxious people but the conclusions are refer to elevated anxiety. Could the authors explain better?

Discussion

The discussion must be shorter and the grammar needs to revised to a better readability and intelligibility.

Page 12, line 45. More details about similar studies should be provided to support the initial part of discussion. Another problem in this manuscript includes improper use of terminology. First, the term "clinical characteristics" in discussion must been better defined. What are the clinical variables used? After, "cognitive factor such as gender, education…" Should the authors explain why education and gender are considered as cognitive factors?

Page 12, line 47. The sentence is not clear. Please rewrite it.
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