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The manuscript addresses an important topic. Adequate statistical methods were used. It is interesting and well written and I have only minor points.

1. Minor essential revision: In Table 1 the total number of girls (76+65+117=258) is not consistent with the Abstract and the Results section.

2. Minor essential revision: In the Abstract (part methods) numbers of 252 girls and 232 boys are mentioned but are not consistent with Figure 1 and the Results section.

3. Minor essential revision: Part ‘Potential confounders’ in the Results section: it would helpful to add one or two sentences how to read Table 3 (i.e. for explaining that a non-significant result in Table 3 means that the confounder is a mediator). Furthermore in this section: in my understanding the statement “The association of migration with physical health was mediated by parental educational level, paternal occupation and screen time.” should be “The association of migration with physical health was mediated by parental educational level and screen time.” because paternal occupation was significant in physical health in the Ballabeina study. Paternal occupation should be mentioned in the next sentence “The association of migration with total HRQOL scores was mediated by parental educational level, paternal occupation, children’s BMI and screen time.” because paternal occupation was NS for Total Score in the Ballabeina study. In the following sentence it is stated that “Social functioning and psychosocial health were not mediated by any of those confounders.” Is this correct? In psychosocial health all confounders showed NS results and only for social functioning the results for all confounders were significant.

4. Minor essential revision: Part ‘Potential confounders’ in the Results section: I did not understood the following statement about the Youp’là bouge study: “In Youp’là bouge, none of the investigated confounders mediated the association of parental migrant status with the children’s HRQOL except for physical activity.” because Table 3 shows also NS results for all confounders for emotional functioning.

5. Minor essential revision: Part ‘Potential confounders’ in the Discussion section (second paragraph) is stated that “The dimensions most impacted by confounders were school functioning and physical health and …..”. Regarding the results in Table 3, in my understanding the statement should be “The dimensions most impacted by confounders were school functioning and psychosocial health and …..”. Furthermore, the first sentence of the third
paragraph (“In both studies, children with migrant parents has lower levels of the physical, social and school dimension, while no differences were found regarding the emotional dimension.”) seems some inconsistent with Table 2 because in the Ballabeina study there was a difference in emotional functioning. It would helpful to add one or two sentences for explaining this.

6. Minor essential revision: In the Supplementary table 1 are results for subgroups (<=median of duration of stay and > median of duration of stay). What are the numbers with parenthesis, e.g. ‘Crude’: 1.25 (0.21)? How is the median defined because there are unequal numbers in both subgroups? Furthermore, the last sentence in Participants’ characteristics states (Results section) that the median length of stay in Youp’là bouge study was 12 for migrant fathers and 10 for mothers. In the explanation under the Supplementary table 1 is the median=14 years. This was some misleading for me.

7. Minor essential revision: In the last row of Supplementary table 2 an asterisk (“*”) is used but not explained (“Varni, gastrointestinal, 5-18y*”).
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