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Reviewer's report:

I was looking forward to reading the new evidence that this paper was going to bring about, yet I have to say that there is not much new evidence yet so far.

Subsequently, my main concerns regard this lack of evidence:

- introduction: There have been several meta-analyses and reports written with detailed information of migrant maternal and newborn health in Scandinavia and Europe that is now lacking. Please check that literature from the last years, including WHO guidelines and reports and be more precise in describing what the exact risk factors are in these groups. It remains too general at this stage.

- the MAMMACT intervention itself: it is not described on which evidence the intervention is based, and what exactly the leaflet and app were about and what they targeted to do. There is no description of what the training session dealt with, and how the intervention was designed, what instructions the midwives got, how the evaluation of this intervention was going to be done. Subsequently, the findings were to be expected: it is rather worrisome that the midwives felt the 5-hour training lacked modules on how to use the leaflet and app (=intervention), how to introduce it to the target group (cfr later in results where some introduced it as a research project, others did it differently: where they then not instructed on how to do that?) + also the finding that most of the midwives did only introduce it but did not use the tools in follow-up anymore, again: where they not instructed what the intervention entails, and consequently can we then consider this an evaluation of an intervention research-wise? I strongly doubt that in how the intervention was now described.

- furthermore in the results section it is written in 3.1.1: all information was posted online: which information and how does this differ from what is dealt with in the leaflet and the app?

- also page 8 about reproductive health literacy and pathways for health information: this is already well evidenced in literature, was this not taken into account when designing the intervention, if so yes: what exactly, if not: why not?

- same page: the quote on anatomy course: also this is quite known to be a barrier: did the intervention not provide this basic info? cfr above
All of these elements put some questions to what is brought about in the discussion section: so far this paper does not bring new evidence nor does it question current evidence in this field. When reading the paper as it is now, the intervention seems like a good intention, but not as an intervention that is based on evidence, and an intervention that was meant to be scientifically evaluated from the start.

I'd be happy to review another version of this paper, where all of these elements are integrated and better explained.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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