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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Decker,

Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to revise the manuscript based on the comments of the two reviewers. We also thank the reviewers for their critical reading and their valuable feedback. We have modified the manuscript accordingly using “track changes” mode (in the course of the revision, some reference numbers have been changed and updated. These changes are not highlighted in track changes mode to prevent problems with our citation software).

In the following, we would like to respond to the reviewer comments point-by-point.

Comment: Reviewer reports:

Javad Alizargar (Reviewer 1): Dear Authors

Thank you for submitting your valuable work to this journal

Please note the following:

The introduction, discussion and conclusions are too long; please make them shorter by pointing out important data

Response: Following the reviewer’s valuable advice, we have shortened some sections of the introduction, discussion and conclusions.

Comment: Please add p value and post hoc tests for each group in table 1
Response: As far as we understand, the reviewer suggests to test for differences between a) non-migrants and migrants from EU countries, b) non-migrants and migrants from non-EU countries as well as c) migrants from EU countries and migrants from non-EU countries. Given that Table 1 provides only a sample description, we do not consider this multiple tests necessary and they could potentially be misleading. Our current presentation follows the standard approach also used in other recent papers published in BMC Public Health (e.g., https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/track/pdf/10.1186/s12889-019-7591-6). We therefore suggest keeping our current format of presentation. If deemed necessary, of course, we can implement the changes as requested.

Comment: Please edit the figures as they should be self-explanatory, you can rewrite the numbers in the figure as they should be horizontal not vertical. Thank you

Response: We thank the review for this comment and have adjusted the figures accordingly.

Comment: Showket Hussain (Reviewer 2): The present study conducted a large-scale population survey to examine the difference in utilization of cervical cancer screening by migrants and non-migrants in Germany through the Andersen Model of Health Services Use. The manuscript is well-written and clear. However, there are some comments/suggestions to be taken care off.

Comments:

Abstract:

There are a lot of grammatical and sentence formation mistakes in abstract. It should be properly reframed.

Response: We thank the review for that comment. We proofread the entire manuscripts once again and have made revisions were necessary. As regards the abstract, we made some changes in the background and one correction in the conclusion section. Else, we could not identify any errors.

Comment: Introduction

Insert a comma-"By means of multivariable analyses, all of these…socioeconomic factors"

Response: Thank you. We have added the comma accordingly.

Comment: Please reframe it to " In addition, qualitative studies have revealed that migrants encounter different types of barriers in the health care system, such as poor language proficiency…"
Response: We have revised the sentence accordingly.

Comment: Page 4-Line 11_ please insert ).

Response: We are not sure what the reviewer is referring to here and kindly ask the reviewer to specify.

Comment:

Methods: Please mention about the value of significance taken into consideration.

Response: We had mentioned in the method section that odds ratios (OR) and their 95%-confidence intervals have been reported as effects estimates. We now have added a further sentence, stating that for the descriptive tests the significance level was set to \( p < 0.05 \).

Comment:

Results: The authors should have mentioned the P-value to actually test whether the results observed are significant or not.

Response: Given that the p-values of the descriptive tests are included in the table, we did not include them in the text to enhance readability. This approach follows other recent papers published in BMC Public Health. If necessary, we can, of course, add p-values. As regards the presentation of the multivariable results, we have added p-values to Tab. 2.

Comment:

Tables: Please check the spelling of eastern in Table 1.

Response: Thank you. We have corrected the typo.

Comment: In table 1 under "Type of Residential area", analysis in terms of urban and rural stratification will work? The authors have divided into many parts. Please clarify.

Response: We have used the standard definition (see reference No. 36) based on recommendations also followed in other studies from Germany. Given that the sample size is sufficiently large, we suggest to keep that categorization in order to ensure comparability with other studies in the field.

Comment: What about the significance of results in Table 2? Please mention the P-value
Response: Given that we 95%-CI, we consider p-value not necessary. However, in case this is a requirement, we have added this information into table 2, as requested.