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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions

Overall impression
1. This is an important topic which requires careful consideration and analysis. This paper needs extensive editing before it will be suitable for publication. All of the comments below are considered to be major compulsory revisions.

Background
2. Page 6 paragraph 2 and 3. The definition of migrant is very unclear. Do the authors mean that a child is defined as a migrant if they were born in Switzerland but their parents were not born in Switzerland? Also how do these definitions apply to EU and non EU citizens. Also how does this relate to having Swiss nationality? If a child is born in Switzerland does this automatically mean they are a Swiss citizen.

Methods
3. General comment. It is fine that the full details of the interview questions are not explained. However, it is important to understand the domains of non medical care that were included in the questioning.

4. Page 8 paragraph 2. The authors need to describe the study setting in more detail. Eg number of hospital beds , level of care provided including hospital care, approximate population served. This should be provided here or in the first paragraph of the results.

5. Page 9 paragraph 2. It is not at all clear that a systematic literature review was conducted. The authors should provide the detailed methods that they used if they wish to include it in a scientific methods section. Otherwise this section should be deleted and the relevant articles should be discussed in the background section and discussion. For a formal systematic review it is important to include the actual search terms. Looking at the reference list at the end of the paper it is surprising that more non European articles were not located, especially from the Medline, Global Health and Embase searches. Perhaps if the authors included the words ‘refugee’ or ‘immigrant’ they may have found more articles. The non EU literature is especially important as many lessons can be learned from migrant care in the US, Canada and Australia which also have large migrant populations.
Results
6. Page 10 paragraph 2. It was not clear from the methods that parents were interviewed as well, also there are no results presented from parent interviews. So were parents interviewed or is this the mention of ‘parents’ here a typo or a grammatical error?

7. Page 10 paragraph 3. The authors need to restate here how many staff members were interviewed and what was the professional level e.g. nurse, consultant, etc.

8. Page 11 paragraph 2. The authors need to explain what the information in brackets means e.g. (SW3)

9. General comment. The fact that no information from the literature review was provided in the results sections indicates that a formal systematic review was not performed. The authors should provide the detailed results of the systematic review in the results section. Otherwise the information about the literature review should be deleted from the methods and the relevant articles should be discussed in the background section and discussion.

Discussion
10. General comments. In general the discussion is clear and to the point and discusses the important elements of the project.

11. Further discussion is needed in the limitations sections especially around the small sample size of the project.

12. Also as the characteristics of the hospitals were not described it is not clear which level of hospital the results can be generalised to. E.g. large tertiary hospitals or smaller district hospitals? This is also important when considering the recommendations. Also there should be some discussion about the non participating hospitals and how different they were from the participating hospitals. Also there should be recommendations for further research.

Conclusions
13. The authors should also restate the need for further research in this conclusions section.

Tables and Figure
14. Too much information is provided. All tables and figures need simplification with key messages provided only.

References
15. There are a number of typos in the reference section. Also a number of the references look odd including reference 9 which refers to an email. The authors should refer to standard referencing guidelines.
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