Reviewer's report:

In this paper the authors describe the prevalence of eight risk factors of heart disease and the association with sex, age and employment status among Chamorros living in San Diego County. The authors state that this information is of importance for health professionals who work with the Chamorro patients to understand and optimize the health and wellbeing of the Chamorro community. It is beyond no doubt important in a local community to know the status of the people before any kind of intervention takes place. The problem is whether this study contributes to the international knowledge as regards cardiovascular diseases. It is well known that individuals from ethnic minorities migrating to westernized countries will adapt their way of living and will obtain the risk factors for cardiovascular disease seen among the local people to a more or less extent. The message could be of interest if the authors had similar data collected in the similar way on other ethnic minorities and on Caucasians living in the same area.

Major compulsory revision:
1. The individual response rate was 62.8% (which is rather fair in a telephone interview survey). During the study the authors had to change strategy as regards recruitment because too few men were willing to be interviewed. Finally, there was unwillingness to report about household income and desirable body mass index. All these factors may lead to some kind of selection bias. The authors should discuss their results in the light of this possible selection bias.
2. Why did the authors aim at 100 men and 100 women? This is a very small sample and they have not argued by means of statistical power calculation that this should be sufficient to analyse their aims. According to the methods there were 658 Chamorros in San Diego County. Why did they not try to contact them all?
3. What is the lesson for the international scientific society? It is already known that the ethnic minorities may suffer another risk factor profile than the Caucasians. What is the special case here? Do the Chamorros have another risk profile than could be expected from their diet or physical activity pattern?

Minor essential revisions:
4. The first five lines on the results section actually belongs to the section under statistics.
5. The first three lines in the results section regarding body mass index must belong to material and methods and the next couple of lines should be used in the discussion where limitation of the study should be discussed.
6. In the results section under Physical Activity™ it is confusing that they start with the CDC recommendations and end up with the AHA recommendations when they look at the age stratified analysis.
7. In the results section under Weight Management™ I wonder how 5% both can try to loose weight and maintain current weight at the same time?
8. In the second section in the discussion I think it is inappropriate to compare their detailed telephone interview data with other data from other studies without giving any information about age and sex distribution and way of collecting these data.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Reject because too small an advance to publish

Level of interest: An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal
Quality of written English: Acceptable
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