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- How somatic and cognitive depressive symptoms scores are calculated and used in the analyses needs to be more explicit in the methods section.

- Why the cut-off point of 5 has been chosen for depressed and non-depressed categorization needs a rationale and should be supported with the literature. Besides, why there was a difference in the results between using the cut-off point of 10 and 5 in terms of statistical significance may need an explanation.

- NYHA class was not associated with the levels of anxiety this needs to be emphasized in the results section.

- Some results were overly stated, "... when comparing those not depressed with depressed patients, features that marked worse physical status became extraordinarily outstanding".

- Can the authors provide a rationale in the text for why they have separated the analyses for different AP types such as SAP and UAP? In the preliminary analyses, the type of angina pectoris was not significantly associated with anxiety and depression levels.

- Adjustments were only made for gender, age, BMI and education, other variables included in the preliminary analysis such as EF and creatinine clearance perhaps could also have an influence on the outcome.

- In the binary regression analysis in table 6 which cut-off point used for the dichotomous outcome variable whether it is 5 or 10 needs to be clear in the methods section.

- In table 1 "TIL" needs to be changed to "TLI" please correct.

- Please also indicate that GAD7 is 7 item scale scored between 0-21.
- In the discussion section, the contribution of the findings was overstated "This study may help partly explain … why left ventricular assist device can help heart failure patients reduce anxiety and depression, why antidepressant is hardly to be efficient to improve prognosis in CHD patients…” which this study did not aim to assess for.

- In the limitations, it can be mentioned that only some of the variables could have been adjusted for due to small sample size. Other variables such as EF and creatinine clearance perhaps could have an impact on the depression outcome as an association found in preliminary analyses.

- At the end of the paper, the authors concluded that the study findings "…lead to a better understanding of the mechanism of psychosomatic diseases…” Looking at the study results and what this study tested, this assumption is hard to be made.

- There is a great inconsistency in the results for NYHA class II vs I comparison both for SAP and UAP patients this has not been mentioned in the results section. Again for NYHA class II vs I, there was not a significant association with somatic and cognitive depressive symptoms in all AP types.

- Education has been adjusted and shown in table 6 but not in table 7. In the statistical analysis section, it has been stated that "All models were adjusted for age, sex, body mass index (BMI) and education background". If education has not been adjusted for in table 7 this should be noted.

- One limitation is NYHA class IV group of patients could not be investigated separately due to small sample size. Perhaps this study may be unable to represent the seriously ill classification of NYHA IV. Another limitation is that this is a single centered study, therefore, generalisability of the study results needs careful consideration.
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