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Reviewer's report:

This is a 2nd revision of a paper describing a systematic review of the prevalences and risk factors of mental health parameters of immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers in detention centers. I have reviewed the original submission as well.

I noticed the authors took the reviewers comments into consideration. The manuscript is very much improved. The article is interesting and well written. I have some minor comments:

Could the authors provide an inter-rater reliability estimate?

I don't fully appreciate the items provided in the Quality Review Table. It is unclear to me whether the quality of the included studies are appraised in light of the research question of the included paper, or in light of the research question of the systematic review. Of course it is great when a study is carried out qualitatively well. But that is not exactly the purpose of a critical quality appraisal in the context of a systematic review.

As table 2 shows, there are quite some quality issues regarding the included studies. Please make explicit how these issues are weighted in synthesizing the results.

Appendix A still contains the original search (i.e. up to 2015), not the updated search.

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes
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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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