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Reviewer's report:

The paper is of significant interest in the area of migration and health, both in terms of research in the area as well as from a policy perspective.

Major Compulsory Revisions

The methodology is relatively newly developed, but of great potential interest for research in the area of health policy. However, some of the main weaknesses of the manuscript relates to the application of the method and lack of discussion concerning this:

The first step when the factors were reduced is insufficiently described although it probably is of pivotal importance for the results. The procedure was performed by teams in the participating countries. Who made up those teams? Did they get coordinated instructions? In such case those should be clearly described and the principle(s) of deriving the 186 factors should be made very clear. This should be considerably elaborated in the text of the manuscript.

The interviewees represent four categories (academia, NGO, policy makers and practitioners), but could be from very different disciplines (e.g. medicine, law, social science) within the same category when comparing the participating countries. Could some of the discordance stem from differences in disciplines, rather than from differences regarding “general consensus” between those countries, which the authors seem to conclude? This should be more thoroughly discussed by the authors.

Minor Essential Revisions

The description of the content of the nine topics constitutes a large share of the results section. It is rather tedious to read as plain text and is therefore better presented as a table.

Discretionary Revisions

(Very) Minor comment: In the results section, on page 8, it is mentioned that 127 out of 134 invited experts completed the last round, and thus eight experts dropped out. Obviously, this mathematical calculation has gone wrong somewhere…
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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