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**Reviewer’s report:**

Discretionary revisions

1. Please add to the abstract the fact that you focus your discussion on Western countries, with an emphasis on Canada.

Minor essential revisions

2. The abstract is difficult to read. You use very long words, and very long sentences. This makes it difficult to read even to people who are versed in the field. Plugging the abstract into an online readability-assessment calculator I got 23 years of education required to read this. Please simplify your language.

3. You define the acronym FGC more than once. Please fix.

Major compulsory revisions

1. You take for granted that the reader will understand the expression “socio-cultural interactions at the interface of health and migration” – you have it in your title, in your abstract, etc. But I am not sure it is clear. Please describe.

2. Your references 39 and 40 are highly references and quoted. These are final reports (I think), not peer reviewed publications. It would be useful for the reader of this article to know more about the methodology of these focus groups (how many, where, when, with whom, how analyzed, etc.).

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest 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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