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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   The question is developed from previous studies and of high significance to study. However, I do not understand the following sentence (p2, line 8) “To the best of our knowledge, no in-depth analysis has previously been done on the interaction between parents of foreign origin and health care providers” in relation to the aim of further understanding of the variety of experiences of parents of foreign origin regarding their interaction with the PHCHC nurses...”. Wouldn’t then both the parents and the nurses perspective be included in the same study or the text be expressed in another way?!

   A question that is worth considering as studying the aim is whether it is possible “to construct a theoretical model that could explain...” (p 2 line 11) when using a qualitative research methodology?! Is explanation the aim of using qualitative research?

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   As concerns the definition on page 2 I think the authors generalise too far about the concept of ethnicity and that it is not used to classify inhabitants in Scandinavian countries (what reference source is used??). There are studies using ethnicity but what is important here is to tell what definition that is used in the study and also to clarify that according to the official statistics in Sweden the definition used when describing persons originating from other countries (immigrants/refugees etc) or being born abroad is stating the country of birth – thus being foreign-born - which means that also people born in Scandinavian countries can be included. In order to not confuse the reader it is then better to tell what definition that is used in here and give a reason for excluding some groups.

   In settings I do lack a reference to the national program for child health care by the National Board of Health and Welfare.

   Using Grounded theory (GT) as a method is a good choice in relation to the studied problem. However, under “Design” and in the methods section I think it is very confusing that so many different sources as concerns GT is used. I do not understand the mix of both Glaser, Strauss & Corbin and Charmaz and not why Charmaz ontology is referred to if using the other older sources. I think the authors need to study the differences between the sources and decide which
they are following. (thus the matching between references in text and reference list will also be better as there are now sources in the text which is not in the list!).

What I do lack in the methods section is a clear description of the sampling method according to GT and the analysis of data. In the Methods section and the discussion the authors need to be consequent in therminology and to follow the theoretical sampling strategy.

I do lack information about whether written informed consent was obtained and I do question whether confidentiality can be guaranteed by showing data as in Table 1 which gives a clear risk of identification of the respondents. The information included can be added as a brief description of the sample characteristics in the Methods section instead.

In the section I do lack information about how the pilot interviews, why where they made and what they led to?

How was Rigour or credibility guaranteed in the study?

What about language when interviewing this group of very heterogenous sample of foreign-born persons? Was an interpreter used?

3. Are the data sound

The results section is good and the figure gives a good picture of the results. What I do lack is an explanation of how trustworthiness was guaranteed.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Yes. See above.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and supported by the data?

What I do lack in the Discussion of the results are what the characteristics in terms of great cultural distance and migrational background (being refugee or not) of the studied sample means to the results? And whether this is a strength or a limitation of the study with this biased sample?! Another question worth thinking of in discussing the results is what does the cultural background mean when it comes to expectations on health care staff from the respondents? In different cultures the expectations might be related to whether health care staff are perceived as having an authoritative or a negotiating role. The authors might be helped by looking at for example the work of Hofstede, G. (1984). Culture’s consequences. Another helpful source is the national Handbook for health care in Sweden (2010).

I do also lack a discussion of the language, both verbally and non-verbally, and what it implies for the results. This need also to be connected to the importance of using interpreters in health care and their role in establishing rapport. Another thing that is worth considering is the method of getting information from patients, do we always have to ask questions isn-t it better to show interest and try to get patients to tell stories?
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
See above, and discussion about rigour or credibility in relation to GT is another thing that need to be elaborated.
What I do not understand in this section is how the language ability in the respondents were judged.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
In the introduction as well as in the paper in general there are a lot of old references, e.g no 1, 10, 13, 14, 28 (might be a key reference but?...), and 29. Here I would advice the authors to update these with new materials or delete some. There are for example new Public Health reports published in Sweden that ought to be used instead of a social report since 2006.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Title ok.
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