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Reviewer’s report:

The article on ‘Access to primary health care among Burmese migrants in London: a cross-sectional descriptive study’ by Nyein Chan Aung et al is interesting research work on public health point of view and this is an appropriate journal for publication.

There are very few studies on the migrants in UK. So It is important to add this into that literature. However, I have a few points (Discretionary Revisions) that need to be considered before considering for publication:

1. Methods:
   • Name it as ‘Materials and Methods’.
   • Page 6. Some of the statements mentioned in the ‘Statistical Analysis’ are very general statements. The author is expected to mention specifically the variables considered for each statistical method (to facilitate Readers to understand better). For example, ‘linear association was carried out between continuous explanatory variables (?) and GP registration’.
   • The criteria for selecting variables based on bivariate analysis for multivariate analysis do not go with conventional criteria. Conventionally, those variables which were significant at 5% or maximum of 20% level (p<0.20) will be included in the multivariate analysis. Why has the author chosen to include up to p<0.6?

2. Result:
   • A sentence/paragraph should not start with numbers. However, the number can be written in words.
   • Page 7 & 8.
   • Put the description of 5-point scale as well as 10 questions (whatever you have put it in the brackets in the result section) in the materials and methods section instead of results section.
   • Page 6 & 7.
   • The author has mentioned in the ‘Study population and sample size’ that Burmese migrant lived more than 5 years in UK were recruited for the study whereas in the analysis it was observed that ‘nearly 38% of respondents were students with a stay of one or more’. Can you kindly clarify this?
Knowledge Page 8.

- Instead of saying ‘out of 5 questions, 3 questions were answered….’. Please describe it. The author should provide the information directly to Readers instead of Readers trying to understand from different sources.

Pages 8: second paragraph

- “…. The registered population had less knowledge on health care entitlements of asylum seekers than the unregistered population”. Readers may like to have the table for this inference. Instead of presenting OR and p-value, presenting OR and its 95% Confidence Interval (CI) is recommended.

Page 9: GP registration

- The ORs reported in the text do not match with table 1. It is better to have OR & its 95% CI than OR and p-value. When the computer output shows p value as 0.000, kindly report it as p<0.001 in the report.

- It was attempted to find out correlation co-efficient between a continuous variable (age, etc.,) and nominal variable (GP registration). It is not appropriate. Instead, the author may compare summary measures ( Mean (SD) if variable is normally distributed in each nominal group or Median (IQR) if variable is not normally distributed in one of the nominal groups) between two groups : people registered with GP and people not yet registered with GP.

- Multivariate analysis may be repeated after considering all the above points

3. Discussion

- “ Our study found a relatively high …..”. Is it related to migrants from other nearby countries (such as Nepal, etc., ) to UK? Have you looked into the literature? If so, support with reference.

- “ The statistical analysis showed that being 35years or older, .......... were the main barriers hindering Burmese migrants from accessing PHC services “. Where is the result for this statement? Whereas the number in the table 1 provides different conclusion.

4. Figure captions

- It is recommended to have the figure caption, possibly, inside the graph or write it at the bottom of the graph instead of having it separately.

Figure

- In order to make graph simple and easy to comprehend, kindly provide information related to the time of survey in each graph.

- Let the category ‘Others’ should be at the end or bottom of the graph instead of 1st category or middle (fig 1, 3,4).

- Fig 2. The order of the category may be reversed in order have the order as it is in the questionnaire

5. Tables
• Table 1: There is no need of chi-square statistics, degrees of freedom and p-value. CI and p-value are related and CI is more informative than p-value. Thus the columns in the table will have headings such as No (%) for each category of GP registration, OR and its 95% CI. The OR against reference category of the independent variable may have the value of 1. This will facilitate Readers to understand which reference category is.

• Table 2: The author may provide numbers with similar heading as suggested for table 1

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.