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Reviewer's report:

Assessment of the paper by Kristiansen M et al. Inclusion of migrant and Danish-born cancer patients in research in a hospital setting: methodological challenges and lessons learnt.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The question could be stated more clearly. The reader concludes after reading the introduction that special attention will be paid to the inclusion of migrants (besides Danish born patients) in cancer research, but this turns out to be the case in a very limited way; also the results are very scarcely directed to this subject. The title also suggests that both migrant and non migrant groups are of interest, but this thus is ultimately misleading.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The methods part is clearly described, but suggests a qualitative approach, in which some things remain unexplained: the authors combine an analysis of field notes and structured interviews: why two methods? Why a structured interview when the analysis is qualitative?

Also, the authors suggest that identification of migrants based on the name of respondents is current practice, but this is really not always the best method; the authors made a heavy selection in the literature to adstruct this position.

3. Are the data sound?
Difficult to evaluate. No attention is paid to this subject. From the results part I often had the impression the authors selected a non controllable part of the results. Also is not clear how the methods applied are dealt with ultimately in the analysis and the presentation of the results.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Difficult to judge on the basis of this manuscript. Nevertheless there is a lot of repetition in the manuscript. The authors distinguish between internal and external barriers but this distinction is not clear. Under the heading of "internal barriers" a lot already mentioned under "external barriers" is repeated. The distinction is conceptually not clear: an other example: why a high staff turnover is considered as an external factor?
Some parts of the results are of a very general character and somehow open doors (e.g. the part on the medical culture).

Anyway, because of this and because a lot is repeated, the results do not really add a lot to what we already know. Also, it is unclear how these results have been distilled from the data.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes, but again a lot of repetition. The results may have been very specific for this study; so the relevance for other studies is at least doubtful.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
The limitations of this particular analysis are scarcely described. The authors rather discuss the study on which this study is based.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
To some degree, as I mentioned, the connection between the introduction and the rest of the paper is not very clear.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
No, see comment above regarding the title.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
English could be improved to some degree.