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Reviewer's report:

The question that this article addressed is well defined. The methods are appropriate and well described.

In general the data is well defined. However, the authors use "general population" to describe what is in fact the top 80% of the population. This is a bit confusing. Might not one expect it to refer to the all the population other than ROMA. This should be corrected. This does not alter the key findings since most of these are based on comparing Roma with the lowest quintile (20%) of the population only.

The manuscript adheres to relevant standards for reporting and data presentation. However, the reviewer finds that the detailed exposition of Roma history is not essential to the question the paper addresses and could be edited down for better presentation. The definition of "Effective Coverage" (last line page 11 and first line page 12) is unclear and confusing. The discussions and conclusions and recommendations are well balanced, limitations are clearly stated and other sources clearly acknowledged.

The title and abstract accurately convey what has been found and the writing is acceptable.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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