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**Reviewer's report:**

The paper is clear and well written. The limitations are accurately described. It would be of greater value if the programs mentioned in the final paragraph were described in the discussion and advice provided on how to address the problem that has been uncovered.

The paper by Ian Hill Smith in the Primary Care cardiovascular Journal PCCJ vol 3,issue1;51-56 2010 and Safia Debar paper in PCCJ vol 2 issue 4 181-183 2009 + Paul Durringtons paper in the same issue p175-180 might be helpful.

Is there any evidence that effective CVD risk evaluation & discussion leads to better concordance with advice?
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