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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. In Background section of the manuscript the authors list various risk scores but then proceed to only validate Framingham and SCORE without explaining why they have not taken this opportunity to validate any of the other models mentioned.

2. The Framingham risk scores are based on a population aged 30-74 (SCORE = 19-80. Were the participants in this analysis aged 20-69 years as these were the only ages in this cohort or were limits imposed and if so why?

3. The mean age of this cohort is much younger than that used to develop the risk models, are women aged 20-35 with no history of CVD or diabetes often given 10yr CV risk profiles? If not, how do we interpret the results of this manuscript? Would the modified treatment levels for fatal CVD be useful in those who are regularly given CVD risk profiles?

Discretionary Revisions

1. The discussion makes no comment on the differences in the populations potentially explaining differences in estimation. One of the most interesting points in this paper is figure one & yet the only reference to it is the brief paragraph in the results section.

2. Could the authors discuss whether fatal CVD calculation is more or less useful than CVD risk estimation in general?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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