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

The strength of this paper lies in its novelty representing confounding factors in recruitment and participation response of participants in Luxembourg for an epidemiological study regarding CVD risk. Avoiding bias in this field is an important factor and the authors exceeded themselves. Being a project leader I understand the hardship and participation bias. I am looking forward to the publication of results.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Old versus young response concern: adequately addressed in discussion but add one-two sentences in your discussion regarding:

   ageing, decrease in health and need to be monitored opposed to young, healthy and no need for attention/monitoring.

   The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example, additional necessary experiments or controls, statistical mistakes, errors in interpretation.

- Minor Essential Revisions

1. Page 5: Description of methodology is been referred to but no reference is given. If you refer to your own results make it clear under which section please.

2. Page 6: meaning of the word “allay”? Use another term please.

3. Page 6, paragraph 3: Refine wording: “chronic conditions, such as malignant neoplasm of the: colon, bronchus, lung, prostate, breast and thyroid; mental and behavioral disorders due to use of tobacco and alcohol, nutritional disorders……”
4. Page 7: Statistical methods: All statistical analyses were carried out (last sentence) must be the first sentence of your section: statistical methods
6. Page 7: Replace sentence of statistical significance with the following suggested sentence: Statistical significance was a two-sided # level of 0.05 or less.
7. Page 8, paragraph 1: Other exclusions were pregnant women (N=21), severe mentally ill (N=5) ....etc.

The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

- Discretionary Revisions: These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.

Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the questions below constitute the report, bearing your name, that will be forwarded to the authors and published on the site if the article is accepted.

What next?
-------

Based on your assessment of the validity of the manuscript, what do you advise should be the next step?

- Accept without revision
- Accept after discretionary revisions (which the authors can choose to ignore)
- Accept after minor essential revisions (which the authors can be trusted to make): YES
- Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsary revisions
- Reject because scientifically unsound
- Reject because too small an advance to publish (note that BMC Medical Research Methodology will publish all sound studies including sound negative studies)

Level of interest
-----------------

BMC Medical Research Methodology has a policy of publishing all scientifically sound research whatever its level of interest. However if you choose one of the first three categories below, we may ask the authors if they would like the manuscript considered instead for the more selective journal BMC Medicine.

- An exceptional article (of the kind that might have warranted publication in such journals as Nature, Cell, Science, New England Journal of Medicine, British
Medical Journal)
- An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field (of the kind that might be found in the leading specialist journal in its field, such as Immunity, Development, Journal of Clinical Investigation, Gastroenterology)
- An article of importance in its field: YES
- An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
- An article of limited interest
- An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

Quality of written English: Some minor language editing problems which needs attention

As we do not charge for access to published research, we cannot undertake the costs of editing. If the language is a serious impediment to understanding, you should choose the first option below, and we will ask the authors to seek help. If the language is generally acceptable but has specific problems, some or all of which you have noted, choose the second option.

- Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
- Needs some language corrections before being published: YES
  - Acceptable

Statistical review

Is it essential that this manuscript be seen by an expert statistician?

If you feel that the manuscript needs to be seen by a statistician, but are unable to assess it yourself then please could you suggest alternative experts in your confidential comments to the editors.

- Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report: Approved and Accepted.
- Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
- No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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