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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your work on an interesting and understudied subject.

Methods in abstract should be much more defined. Additionally, consider reframing the background section as your reported results are not closely related to education, access to healthcare, etc.

(Lines seem to be double-numbered, my comments refer to the outer, single space line numbers)

Please define flight

If possible, please use more than one reference to support your claims (page 3, lines 35-37)

The second paragraph is disjointed; please consider rearranging to make the study objective more prominent as the topic sentence. Can you add any background information specific to Sweden (e.g., numbers of refugees resettled there yearly, comparisons of refugee health to general Swedish population)?

Page 4, line 19, what do you mean by gatekeepers? Are they legally appointed guardians of some sort? This may be simply a translation issue.

Page 4, line 29, if you approached 100, how are the 11 who accepted a convenience sample? Please rephrase if these are the subset who agreed to be interviewed. Additionally, I do not see anything here about human subjects approval, steps taken to protect privacy, consent process, etc.

Page 4, line 46, please specify the language(s) of interviews and cultural considerations taken into account. Did the interviewer have any specific experience interviewing highly vulnerable populations, translation, etc.? Was there a translator present? What was the gender of the translator?

Did you collect anything on interviewee age, maternal status, etc.? If so, this would be a valuable addition.

Table 1 needs significant revision. "Meaning unit" is unclear. I would recommend not including this as a table and instead reincorporating this information into the text. Or, consider other ways to increase the amount of information in this table.
Discussion (page 12 lines 42-50), the argument for use of a translator is confusing and I am not sure (based on the current version) that I agree that a phone-based translator eliminates the bias introduced by power imbalances. Additionally, the high education level among your interviewees likely indicates that your convenience sample is not representative.

**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.

Yes

**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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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