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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors

Thank you for your interesting paper.

I found your manuscript clearly presented and well written, however, the paper and its validity could be greatly improved considering the following points which I outlined below and considered most of them as essential revisions before publication;

1. First of all, you have tried to compare your findings with a similar study on Malaysian people. I think this comparison is not academically appropriate in your research unless you recruited the Malaysian people as well and matched the characteristics of both populations. I strongly suggest you to remove all these sections and the table 3 and report only your findings on the immigrants.

2. In the first paragraph of your BACKGROUND you have identified various types of migrations; if it is possible in this stage, it is better you describe your sample on their immigration type too as it might change the discussion of your results if the frequency of different types of migrations is known.

3. The ‘methods’ section needs more revisions; you need to address the following questions in this section: A) Information on sample size calculation B) Your sampling method needs to be clearly explained (How and from where and with which method you selected your study population). The sampling method and your survey design is important to be considered in your statistical analysis, for example if you applied cluster sampling method, then you can not use simple t-test and ANOVA (because correlation between samples are higher in clusters and so standard errors should be higher). C) Method of data collection; self-administered questionnaire, postal questionnaire, interview, etc... explain. D) Why not doing linear regression instead of just t-test and ANOVA controlling for some of the confounding variables?

4. Shortly describe characteristics of non-respondents e.g. who refused participation?

5. I suggest showing the results of the table 2 using a chart rather than the table; it is difficult to compare different groups in a table.

6. Why you have not reported two component scores (MCS and PCS) of SF-36 as long as reporting 8 dimensions? These make the comparison between groups much easier.

7. Do not use the verbs such as ‘A influences/effects B’ in a cross-sectional study
8. For me, your discussion on gender inequality in HRQOL is not satisfactory. There are much more evidence for social determinants of HRQOL regarding gender inequality rather than ‘hormonal variation’ as you suggested.

9. As a limitation of your paper is to include all age # 18 years old. Given rather small sample size of your research it was much better to only focus on a specific age group or at least to include only adults (18-65 years old), as age is very significantly associated with HRQOL. You need to add this limitation to your discussion.

10. As another limitation of your research is to exclude illiterate immigrants which might importantly influence on our results (one of your inclusion criteria is being able to read and write Arabic), while you have mentioned that due to the compulsory education policy in Iraq no illiteracy exist. So you need to clarify this.
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