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Reviewer's report:

General comments
This paper describes an outreach screening project targeting first generation Korean immigrants. The paper presents the seroprevalence found but also practical aspects of the programme like linkage and access to care, which is very relevant as it will help defining best practices for migrant screening.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. When I read the title I thought the paper would describe how Korean immigrants perceive their risk for hepatitis B. As this is not covered I would suggest to change the title to better reflect the content of the paper.

2. In the background section it is mentioned when the US started vaccinating, and when the WHO recommendations were made. It would be informative to include when vaccination started in Korea.

3. On page 5 (last paragraph of background) it is stated that it is difficult to estimate HBV prevalence among Koreans. But why is this so? It looks like the authors intend to say there are no data available, which is a different issue.

4. In the methods on page 6 term reflex is used. I have never heard of this term. Can this be explained? It looks like it can just be replaced by ‘test’.

5. Page 7, last paragraph. The authors explain they calculated weighted prevalences but it is not clear where these weighted prevalences are presented in the results, and it is not clear what the authors wish to achieve with weighing. This should be explained.

6. Page 8, 2nd paragraph. A p-value of a test for difference in age distribution between men and women is presented but it is not stated in the methods which test was used. I assume it was a T-test but this should be included in the methods section.

7. Page 8, last paragraph. What is the rationale for presenting data on alcohol consumption among participants as alcohol is not a factor you would assume to be related to having a chronic hepatitis B infection.

8. Page 9, 1st paragraph. Please also report the 95% CI for the prevalence of chronic infection.
9. Page 9, 2nd paragraph. The first sentence should be moved to the second paragraph were viral load is described.

10. Page 9, second paragraph. The last part about family history is unclear. First of all, make it more explicit to which group ‘This group …’ refers. I assume it is referring to those infected. If that is the case, 41.4% of those infected would have family history of liver disease (as 58.6 did not), but in the past sentence a percentage of 6.3 is mentioned.

11. Page 9, last paragraph. Half of those infected had been tested before. Do you also know how many of those were aware of their serological status?

12. When reporting on viral load it would be informative to report the distribution across the 3 categories <2,000 / 2,000-20,000 / >20,000 as these are relevant in clinical management (AASLD treatment guidelines).

13. Page 9, last sentence. I suggest to change Reflex to Further, or Additional.

14. Page 10, first sentence. The lack of health insurance appears to be a huge barrier for follow up. To avoid unnecessary costs for positive participants, has the option of using clinical indicators like HBV DNA, HBeAg and ALT to select patients for referral been considered? The majority of chronically infected patients would have inactive disease requiring yearly follow up of ALT only.

15. Page 10. See remark 6. It is not described in the methods which statistical tests were used.

16. Discussion. This study indeed shows the prevalence among adult Korean immigrants is lower than expected, but it is still above 2%, warranting screening. This last aspect could be emphasised a bit more.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The term rate is used throughout the paper when prevalence is meant.
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