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Reviewer's report:

It is a very well written paper related to the primary health care utilization among African immigrants in Norway. I have the following suggestion for revision:

1. The GP visits and ER visits in the year 2008 was studied in this paper. About 62%-63.9% individuals visited GP, 10.7%-17.5% visited ER (table 2). The mean is 2.42 with SD 3.38 for GP visits, and 0.24 with SD 0.68 (page 5 and table 1). When you calculate the mean, did you only include the individuals with GP visits or ER visits, or you include all individuals regardless they have or not GP or ER visits?

2. The logistic regression was used to explore the GP visits and ER visits between immigrants group. The age, gender, and employment status were adjusted in the model. I am not clear the variable age (numeric variable) or age group were adjusted in the model. Is there any difference in the model, please clarify.

3. The income, immigrant's background, and the reason of immigration are different from the number in table 1. I guess these factors have the effect on the GP and ER visits. I would adjusted for these factors as well in the logistic regression model. Please also discuss this issue in the discussion section.

4. Considering the individuals have the different number of GP visits and ER visits, using the count regression (Poisson regression or negative binomial regression) to explore the GP and ER visits will benefit the study.

5. The figure 1 does not make sense to me. I would remove this figure and compare the proportion of age group, considering the age is different between immigrant groups (table 1).
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