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Reviewer's report:

I really enjoyed reading this paper as I found several interesting and important findings from the paper. The most interesting ones to me include: 1) The poor attitude, and consequently practice, of female migrant workers in accessing RTI services as they thought that 'gynecological examination was only for the married women' and the single female migrant workers are ashamed to seek this examination; 2) The current available IEC channels are not appropriate to migrant workers in industrial zones as female migrant workers have different schedule and interest compared to general female population living in the same area; and 3) The place of residence is not the appropriate place for IEC activities targeting female migrant workers in industrial zones; workplace would be a much better option for such activities.

However, I also found that the authors tried to include too many information in the paper and some of them are not necessary.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

• Title of the paper should be revised. The current title is a bit too broad. I would recommend: 1) to specify that this paper is about the use of RTI; 2) to use 'female migrant workers' instead of 'female migrants' as other types of female migrants were not included; 3) to narrow down location from 'Vietnam' (too broad) to 'Sai Dong industrial zones' (that is the study site; it is too far to generalize this to 'industrial zones in Vietnam').

• Abstract: should be revised upon revision of the paper. The conclusion in the abstract could be stronger with more specific implications/ recommendations/ suggestions.

• The whole background section could be shorten. Last sentence of the first paragraph in page 4 ("Its population grew..."): Specify period/ time frame of the population growth.

• Last sentence in the second paragraph in page 5 ("The majority of female migrants ...") : Elaborate on the idea and specify to make it easy to understand as it is difficult to follow.

• Research objectives of the paper in page 6: The first objective is clear. The second objective is also clear but the authors may want to consider to change 'factors' into 'obstacles' or 'barriers' as the main text of the paper talked specifically about barriers to use and access rather than the 'factors' in general.
The third objective of the paper is about the need of RIT information and service but need was thinly discussed in the finding; the findings on need discussed more about inappropriate of current information channel and suggestions for better channels. I would recommend the authors to discuss about the need in greater details or to change/drop this objective. In fact, the paper provided several important findings relating to integration of migrant population to general population and provision of IEC materials; I would recommend the author to elaborate on that and making suggestions/ recommendations for more effective IEC activities to migrant population could become an important objective of the paper.

- Description of RTI symptoms in page 9 ('The RTI symptoms were based on the syndrome approach described in ...'): Please summarize the symptoms and specify terminologies used or have them in appendix.
- First sentence in the second paragraph under the 'Results' in page 10 ('We expected to have ...'): Reason for this expectation was not found; given the study setting, i.e. migrant workers in industrial zones, the expectation was not realistic and hence it was not surprise to found results that did not meet the expectation. The authors may want to consider cutting this expectation and go straight to the findings. Also, specify that 85.6% of the respondents were temporary registered, not just registered.
- Third and fourth sentence in the second paragraph under the 'Results' in page 10 ('Still, the living conditions were poor ...'): It is difficult to say whether living conditions of the migrants were poor or not here as non-migrants may have similar or higher share of its population using 'drilled-well water'; high proportion of the study population 'sharing toilets' was also expected as most of them live in dormitories or shared houses.
- Under the 'Traditional health beliefs and values' in page 13 are very interesting findings, at least to me, on expected users of the gynecological examination, which is an important barrier to its use among single female migrants. This finding has a strong implication to the increase of the use of gynecological examination among female migrants and should be elaborated more. The authors may also want to consider to change the subtitle of this section to emphasize this important finding.
- Again, the whole part on need of RTI information (in page 17) was too thin to stand alone. It was not clear whether there is a high or low need. Furthermore, the information was also duplicated with what was found in the 'traditional health beliefs and values'.
- The 'Discussion' in page 19 include irrelevant information. It would be better if the authors focus on discussions of findings from this study and elaborate discussions on those findings only. For instance, the whole third paragraph in page 20 ('The proportion of unmarried female migrants ...') has many unnecessary information.
- Second sentence under 'Discussion' in page 19 ('Age, education, .... '): Note that the 2004 Migration Survey as well as many other migration surveys in Vietnam did not include migrants in industrial zones.
• Comparisons with other studies in page 20 and 21 (‘There was up to date no report ....’) are interesting but it is hard to have any implication from those comparisons given the difference of the study population between this and other studies. The last two sentences in the first paragraph in page 21 (‘The fact of higher clinical detection ...could be higher.’) are not correct as those findings cannot ‘indicate’ anything; the difference simply reflects the sample difference between the studies.

• The conclusion and recommendation could be more specific.

- Minor Essential Revisions

• Edit, proofread English and use standardized terms. For instance, the third sentence of the first paragraph in page 4 (“In Vietnam, after the period of Renovation (1986), the economic system switched from budget subsidized to market-oriented economy, ...”): ‘after the period of Renovation (1986)’ should be changed to ‘after the introduction of the reforms started in 1986’; ‘the economy ...’ should be changed to ‘the country experienced transition from centrally-planned to market economy’. ‘marriage status’ in page 9 should be changed to ‘marital status’. ‘Ethic groups’ in Table 1 should be changed to ‘Ethnicity’ or "Ethnic group’.

• Inclusion criteria (last paragraph in page 7) are good but please specify reasons for 6 months to 5 years (?)

• First paragraph in page 8: It was showed that 'These migrants were selected randomly from the sampling frame of 1200 migrants ...'. Were those 1200 migrants met all three selection criteria?

• Quotes in page 12: They are interesting but do the authors have quotes from female migrants? Such quotes could be more important as those quotes were used to support what it was said earlier that 'not all female migrants understand their rights of having health insurance'.

• Last paragraph in page 12: The finding is important but it will be more interesting if the authors can show difference compared to non-migrants (?) Without a reference group, it is hard to judge whether 21.6% of the respondents seeking health care center is a high or low proportion.

• The first paragraph in page 15 ("Alike other residents ...’): Is this implying that female migrants should register at commune health clinics where they live or work instead of district health centers?

• The authors may want to include 'Limitation' of the study under the 'Conclusion'.

- Discretionary Revisions

• Use pie-chart instead of bar-chart in Figure 1 (?)

• Table 1: Under the marital status: what about those who got divorced/separated?

• Table 1: Specify 'Sexual intercourse' as current or ever or what (?)
Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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