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Reviewer’s comments
Overall comments
The authors have undertaken to perform a useful piece of work and provide useful data by comparing a high risk ethnic group for diabetes and cardiovascular disease in their native population and with that of the same ethnic group in a Western immigrant setting.

Minor Essential Revisions
It seems that the hypothesis of the authors had been that the immigrants have higher CVD risk and diabetes. However the data shows otherwise and the authors have failed to adequately explain the possible reasons in spite of the Oslo sample having higher degree of obesity.

The possibilities for this finding may be:
# The marked differences in the sample sizes of the two samples.
# Marked difference between the response rate of the two samples without any data on the non-responders.
# Although most of the variables have been age-adjusted the significant difference in the age between the two samples may have led to some of the findings. Esp the higher prevalence of hypertension and unfavourable lipid profiles may be due to the higher age of the sample in Sri Lanka.
# The differences in the educational and social conditions of the two groups that have led to the Oslo population undertaking healthier lifestyles and increased physical activity levels. Not considering the physical activity levels between the two groups is a significant deficiency in the paper.

Although some of these factors have been mentioned under Strength and Weaknesses all these aspects needs to be included to prevent wrong messages being conveyed due to methodological deficiencies as well as the other effects such as healthier lifestyles in more educated and the Western countries despite higher availability of food.

Specific comments
Abstract
Be consistent with the grammar and state things in the past tense – ‘eg. The purpose of the study is’ – better change as ‘the purpose of the study was’
‘mean systolic and diastolic blood pressure was considerably higher’ why not state – significantly higher?

Page 10
‘cannot be explained bay’ isn’t it ‘cannot be explained by’?

P values in tables – it is customary not to state as 0.00 even when the stats output comes like this, you may state as either <0.001 or less than any reasonable number of decimals you wish.

Discretionary Revisions
It would also be useful to reference more recent epidemiological data from Sri Lanka on diabetes, obesity and smoking by katulanda et al.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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