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Reviewer's report:

Review to the new (third) version of
B.-M. Eliassen et al.: Marginalisation and cardiovascular disease among rural Sami in Northern Norway …

My little critics to the last Versions (areas etc.) are now fulfilled in this version.

But as another reviewer wanted to see always n-Numbers in the tables I now see a new thing that must be cleared:

The sum of n-numbers in the tables 1,2 of the defined prevalence cases are not identical with the n-numbers in table 3.

I don’t compare total crude numbers since they are only in table 3.

But if I compare the total age-adjusted n-numbers in table 3 (for example: 27 unexposed women in Majority - the sum of the corresponding cases in table 1 (9+14+8=31) should not be the same as both are age-adjusted? The same occurs with all other n-numbers.

This could not be seen in the earlier version and it does not affect the odds ratio presentation in table 4 which was and is plausible.

If there is a reason for the differing n-numbers it should be explained in the text or under the tables. If a mistake is underlying it should be corrected and shown before giving permission to publish the article.