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Reviewer's report:

1. Major Compulsory Revisions

Methods para 2. Regarding the random sampling method, authors have to explain how they corrected the different settlement structure on both side of the border. On the Hungarian side there is a relatively great town with more than 32,000 inhabitants without a counterpart on the other side (the greatest village has 12,687 inhabitants.

Methods para 2. There are different names used for the target population, such as people, nations, Hungarians, Romanians. It is unmistakeable by the sampling method that the authors targeted inhabitants with Hungarian or Romanian citizenship of both regions. It must be emphasized at the first occurrence of definitions and later on the persons have to be referred as Hungarians and Romanians.

Results para 1. It is a fact that "the rate of those who have primary education...was significantly higher among the Romanians than the Hungarians". Otherwise, in Discussion para 1 "educational level was more favourable in Hungarians" It is possible that higher education was more frequently among Hungarians, but the sentence must be corrected this way to avoid confusion.

Minor Essential Revision

Background para 5. Mentioning Roma is rather confusing, because this study did not targeted Roma communities. It is the best solution if the authors delete this sentence.

Discretionary Revisions.

Background para 5. In the sentence "The life expectancy at birth..." must be clearly indicated that here are Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria referred.

Background para 6. It is not true that "health improvement requires solid factual information..." Instead of this health promotion programs require information.

Methods para 8. Authors did not use definitely the Pearson coefficient, instead of this they used the Spearman coefficient which is correctly referred in the Table 3.
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