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Reviewer's report:

No doubt this is a topic of great interest in all areas of the globe which receives immigrants and refugees.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The authors have asked too many questions. In other words, the objectives of the paper are many and broad. Each of these could be separate papers. The logical outcome of this is that each topic receives scanty attention – not enough data to describe the phenomenon or to make valid conclusions.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well defined?
The authors claim that the article is based on the data gathered from qualitative techniques, mainly discursive techniques. The section titled ‘population’ is confusing. The title ‘sample’ actually about the groups included in the data collection. No mention is made of the method of recruiting the participants, language of the interviews or the number of participants and their background characteristics such as age, education, employment status etc. A step by step description of discursive analysis is provided under the title ‘data analysis’; however in reading through the article there is no indication that these steps were followed in analyzing the data. Did the authors actually use discursive analysis?

3 & 4. Are the data sound? Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Data from interviews is presented in the form of quotes- both the native language version and the English version are given. I suggest that the English version is sufficient . Some of the categories under which the data is presented is ill-defined- for example, Family Structure- as presented in the article it refers to gender roles with-in the family.

5. Are the discussions and conclusions adequately supported?
There is a lack of coherence between the discussion and the data presented . The data presented in the article does not lead to the discussions. This is also evident in the conclusion at the end of the paper.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
NO

7. Do the authors acknowledge any work upon which they are building?
The article does not have a literature review section. Some references are made-
but in no coherent manner.

8. The title seems fine- but the article doenot accomplish what is suggested in the title.

9. The article needs some language editing as well.

On the whole, this is an overambitious paper, exploring multiple and complex themes, without employing rigorous data analysis and arriving at conclusions not warranted by the data. It requires major revisions. Perhaps with a limited number of objectives, there is scope for more than one article.

Usha George