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Reviewer's report:

The study titled "Differences in primary health care use among sub-Saharan African immigrants in Norway: a register-based study" is interesting, relevant and well-written. However, there are some important points that needs to be addressed prior to publication consideration.

1. Why only 2008 data were included for the purpose of this study (it will be almost a decade old by the time this study reaches potential publication)? The change/increase in immigration is a rather dynamic phenomenon and hence strong justification is required as to why only 2008 data were used and not more recent ones?

2. In the Methods section (sub-section 'Setting and Data Source'), it is mentioned that other SSA immigrant populations were not included due to very small sample size. It is recommended that the authors quantify this.

3. In terms of Table 1, the authors should provide the p-values to demonstrate the group differences. The "overall" column can be brought to the very beginning and then show the differences between these groups.

4. For Table 3, it is important to provide the p-values associated with each OR.

5. I wonder why the diagnostic groups were not included in the logistic regression models to predict GP and ER use? Because to me that would be very important and meaningful. In the Discussion section the authors mention that higher disease burden would help to explain the differences in use. However, this won't be understandable unless the diagnoses are adjusted for.
6. Moreover, why was urban status and marital status not adjusted in the logistic regression models? What is the c-statistics after adjusting for age, gender and employment status? Does it change/improve after adding urban and marital status as well as diagnostic codes?

7. Value from Figure 1 & 2 can be mentioned in Table 1 and these figures can go into the Supplemental section.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
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