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Reviewer's report:

The paper addresses an important issue that has rarely been studied empirically. A pro-active screening approach in low SES areas could indeed be an important starting point for reducing health inequalities. The analyses are quite simple, but in this case this seems to be acceptable. My major concern is that the presentation of the study can be improved considerably (see below).

Major Compulsory Revisions

Abstract
- Methods: The phrase '… Dutch GP with low average SES.' is difficult to understand; please express this point in a better way. Please give some more details for '… and additional risk factors'. What exactly is meant by '… on GP location by a regional GP laboratory…'? 
- Results: Please explain in more detail why the risk profiles are available for just 278 (and not for 354) participants. The sentence 'In similar screenings …' point to a second study that should be introduced and explained in the 'Methods'. 
- Conclusion: A wording like 'high attendance' or 'many new persons' is not very informative, please give numerical information.

Background
- Please phrase the first sentence in a more simple way.
- Please substantiate the information from the UK with numerical information.
- 'In several other countries…': Please give more examples than just from Australia (including numerical information).
- Please substantiate the information from the Netherlands with numerical information (e.g. concerning references 8 and 9).
- Just referring to reference 9 and 10 is not enough, please include more references (and numerical information!) from international studies as well.
- Please substantiate the information '… municipality with low SES …' with numerical information (just giving reference 12 is not enough).
- Please also give a clear hypothesis that is being tested in this study.

Methods
- Why do you especially mention the number of asylum seekers?
- The exclusion criteria should be explained in more detail (e.g. conditions with impaired life expectancy, incapacity to come to the general practice, '... participation was considered inappropriate'). For each exclusion criteria: How many persons have been excluded due to this reason? Why is diabetes given such special importance? What exactly is meant by 'second-line follow-up'?
- Has the representative from LabNoord been placed in the general practice just for this study?
- Why and how did you select this GP and this municipality? Did you also try other GPs and municipalities? What kind of selection bias could have been introduced here?
- 'The region is known for its elevated …': Please substantiate the information with numerical information.
- The experiences from the diabetes screening should be outlined in more detail.
- Please avoid a wording such as 'guarantee'.
- These 141 persons should be found easily in figure 1.
- Concerning the information on SES gathered on the postal code level: Please give more information concerning these data, the rational behind these variables, the algorithm for combining them, the number of postal codes included etc.

Results
- Pre-selection of 584 individuals: Does this include all patients from the GP meeting the inclusion criteria mentioned in the Methods?
- Figure 1: Please also report the participation rates based on the initial sample of 521 persons. The exclusion criteria listed here and those listed in the Methods don't seem to be exactly the same; please use the same wording (resp. criteria).
- It is misleading to write 'all participants' if you are just talking about a subgroup (this refers to the whole paper!).
- Figure 2 is very simple; this information could also be placed in the text without using a figure.
- Figure 3 is more informative. It makes sense to give additional information in the text, for example on gender specific analyses, but in this case the number of participants in these subgroups should be mentioned as well. Also, it could be more easy to present these additional analyses in a table.
- The last paragraph ('Summary data …') should be placed in the discussion, as this information is not based on the current study presented here. Also, it could be more easy to present this additional information in a table.

Discussion
- Please repeat as little information as possible from the previous text.
- Please compare your results in more detail with the empirical results from other (international) studies.

Conclusion
- Please repeat as little information as possible from the previous text.

References
- Many references are just in Dutch. The information from these references should be described in detail in the text.
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