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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The authors refer to the effects of acculturation and first and second generation differences in the introduction, however, this is not the focus of the results of the paper. The results only show a difference in prevalence (odds) at a single point in time and did not look at the prevalence by varying degrees of acculturation or at least varying number of years in the host country. The introduction needs to tie in better with the study results, discussion and scope of study.

2. Paper refers to "length of stay" which implies transiency, but members of this population are permanent residents and thus "length of residence" or "number of years" may be more suitable.

3. Must discuss aspects of Moluccan "culture" in introduction to provide context for readers. Moluccan "customs" is referred to in the discussion--more details would be informative.

4. Please explain why exemption for ethics approval was granted in ethics section (page 7)

5. Are data for income available? This is an important sociodemographic risk factor that would be important to adjust for in the model and/or discussed in the discussion

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. Abstract (methods). <The> primary outcome...
2. Abstract (results): <A> higher prevalence...<was> found...
3. Abstract (results): young Moluccan-Dutch men showed "higher" prevalence...
4. Abstract (conclusion): <reporting> hypertension. Because this is self-report, avoid using "having hypertension" but rather "reporting hypertension"
5. Abstract (conclusion): The last statement is not exactly supported by results of study. The study didn't look at the effects of acculturation perse; only a prevalence at a single point in time.
6. Background (page 4 lines 32 and 36): use commas instead of decimals for large numbers (e.g. 12,500 Moluccans)
7. Background (page 4 line 47): "leading mechanism for _____"
8. Background: Need to provide some rationale for why Moluccan important to study; growing population, unique risk profile, good population to study effects of long term residence in new environment, etc.?
9. Methods (page 6, line 85): "measured by <a> number of ..." 
10. Statistical Analysis(page 7, line 91): "Difference in <the> prevalence"
11. Statistical Analysis (page 7, line 96): "alcohol intake as <the> reference group."
12. Statistical Analysis (page 7, line 98): Prefer if tables not referred to in methods. Also, consider p<0.05.
13. Results (page 8, line 112): "Compared to Moluccan-Dutch, <the>"
14. Results (page 8, line 116): <seemed> 
15. Discussion (page 10, line 138): <than> 
17. Discussion (page 11, line 161): "in our study group <for _____specify group.>"
18. Discussion (page 11, line 164): give examples of Moluccan customs
19. Discussion (page 11, line 172): <showed> 
20. Conclusion (page 13, line 207): remove "the more"

Discretionary Revisions
1. Might be interesting to look at the influence of social networks and characteristics of where Moluccans tend to reside (e.g. living in areas with different concentrations of Moluccans and other immigrant groups)
2. Might be interesting to look at other measures of acculturation; eg language proficiency

**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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