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Reviewer's report:

I reviewed the manuscript "Barriers and recruitment strategies for precarious status migrants in Montreal, Canada." I found the manuscript to be very well-written with some interesting findings that will likely help other researchers who want access to this, and other hard-to-reach populations. I can't recommend the paper for publication in its current form, but I have some comments that I think will help the authors get the paper in better shape.

After reading the paper I think I was able to determine the purpose behind this effort. However, I think the "so what" gets lost in the details or even gets stated in a way that the paper loses its effectiveness. As an example, on page 8 the objectives of the study focus on analyzing the strategies and sharing the lessons. If I understand the paper correctly, it seems to me the authors want to determine the effectiveness of the strategies not merely analyze them. I think that's ultimately what the results section tries to do but the pieces of the paper aren't very well connected. The abstract also does this with a statement about analyzing the strategies but not providing a rational for why.

The methods also lack some clarity. It jumps into a framework and discussing interviewers but who exactly are the interviewers, who are the participants, what is a deliberate workshop, and what is QDA Miner? Similar to my previous comment, there's a certain amount of inferring the reader needs to do to figure out some of these foundational pieces. I think the authors can be a lot more explicit to make their point.

I think once the introduction and methods are straightened out the results will fall more naturally from there. I would encourage the authors to make the results and subsequent advice as clear for the reader as possible. If their intent to is to truly help other researchers with overcoming barriers to recruitment, then providing detailed and translatable strategies will be critical for the uptake. I think Tables 2 and 3 are a step in the right direction.

My last comment would be for the authors to take the opportunity in the discussion section to compare and contrast their findings with other findings from similar research efforts; both with this population and other under-studies populations.
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