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Reviewer's report:

General
This is a nicely written manuscript, the study design of which I like. The figures and major points are presented straightforward and are discussed appropriately. However, I do not feel too comfortable with the data because the difference between the two population are so large in numbers and in the number of risk factors. Therefore, I would like to suggest some improvements to the manuscript to get a clearer idea of what is really behind.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. Did the practitioners include consecutive patients on the same day, the same week or month? How was a consecutive or random inclusion ensured?

2. Is there an indicator that the proportion of indigenous people is the average for Australian primary care?

3. Was the study monitored and who were the monitors (CRO, Servier)?

4. Please be more specific on the lab tests used in the methods section. Is there something like a mean age of data, were lab tests confirmed / recorded twice and is there an apparent difference between the quality of lab test between both cohorts?

5. Please state whether MAU was measured 3x (which would be appropriate but is not feasible in cross-sectional studies), how this may impact on the true prevalence and the relation to the higher number of smokers in the indigenous cohort.

6. It would be certainly necessary not only to report p-values but also the number of patients in each subgroup (for example age subgroup below 40 ..., figure 2 and others) and the confidence interval for the prevalence rates reported.

7. Glycemic control: Please provide all variables that have been adjusted for and the results of the multiple regression analysis.

8. Blood pressure control: Analyses should be adjusted for differences in
baseline characteristics. Younger patients usually have better blood pressure control rates. Even in case of no apparent difference a multiple regression analysis would be necessary.

9. Lipids: Please provide a more fundamental analysis of these values considering baseline differences between the two cohorts.

10. The same is true for the micro- and macrovascular analyses

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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