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Reviewer's report:

Dear Editor,

Thank you for sending me the revised manuscript Assessing refugee healthcare needs in Europe and implementing educational interventions in primary care: a focus on methods

The manuscript has definitively improved as compared to the previous version. Figure 1 really help to understand better.

There are, however, still several queries that I would like the authors to answer for a better understanding of the paper.

In the abstract, the aim of the paper is now stated as "This article describes the cross-border effort that was embarked upon to select, develop and assess approaches and methods for enhancing PHC for refugees through rapid capacity-building actions in the context of a structured European project under the auspices of the European Commission and funded by the Consumers, Health, Agriculture and Food Executive Agency (CHAFEA). " which seems to be in line with what is described further in the manuscript. However, this becomes more unclear later on in the text. Indeed, from line 160 we can read. "This article aims to illustrate both the framework and approaches utilised by the EUR-HUMAN project in its effort to i) assess the health needs of all people that have reached Europe in the period of the project implementation independently their legal status with a more focus on refugees in Europe using a refugee-centred approach, ii) identify, develop and test tools and interventions to give appropriate healthcare to this population group within the frame of European PHC and iii) evaluate the developed educational material and implemented intervention in selected European settings. Facilitate uptake of successful practices across other M-Ss.

The design of the project - a focus on the methods used
To serve especially its third objective,..." I get confused with this: Is this the paper that will especially focus on the first objective? The paper seem to me as a description of the whole process... Please clarify what you mean.

Generally, I still find the language complex and unclear at some points, and many sentences, especially in the introduction part, seem to be unfinished. For instance text in lines 114-117 is completely unclear for me. Also lines 126-129: "However, the focus of this project was on refugees, as Europe experienced massive waves of refugee influx during the period the project was implemented to that reason the text that follows is referring exclusively to refugees, although, migrants are also subjected of the reported actions." make not much sense to me. Other examples in lines 136-138, 141-143, 160 (facilitate what?). Please revise the whole text for grammar errors.

Thank you for providing a definition of compassion. What I was suggesting is a more targeted definition of compassion related to health care. I suggest you move the sentence "Additionally, it has become imperative to assess the importance and role of compassionate care in the context of PHC systems" to after the definition. The problem is that you might not be able to measure compassion as you define it. Therefore, I wonder if your wish to have evidence-based "compassive" intervention is utopic or if it is doable. Some examples could be good to have in the second case. Otherwise, it might be wise to talk about "integration, patient centeredness, comprehensiveness" that are easier to measure.

The whole project seems to try to achieve evidence base tools and approaches. In lines 170-171 you write: "the EUR-HUMAN project decided to utilise an evidence-based and validated approach" However, the methods the project rely on are not the most rigorous ones to create evidence (at least not type A or even B). Although I think their effort is valuable and probably the best approach, this should be discussed as a limitation in the discussion section.

Is the literature review described in line 240 published? If so, give the reference.

I wonder how lines 259-263 suit in the description of the survey among users. Please see if it should be elsewhere.

Line 320 and following: You describe the use of the course, but I wonder why only 1/3 completed? Who were the ones invited to take the course? Average PCH providers or specially interested ones? How do you plan to continue this course? Plans for escalating or giving it publicity if it works well? What were the parts that did not work…
The explanation about the pilot from lines 329 is also unclear: Was this pilot intervention targeted refugees (you write 30 refugees)? or health professionals? If this was only 30, do you believe that the same results would apply in a day with 300 refugees to be attended? How was the pilot assessed?

In the discussion, you write that "This article discusses the need to invest in efforts that inform coordination, policy making, educational and PHC-specific capacity-enhancing interventions." Although you make his issue relevant, you do not actually discuss it… I suggest o delete this sentence.

Line 408: I do not understand what you mean with" A pilot intervention to test how the developed tools and material work in the real world was deployed, not extending to the perception of refugees, although this is an aspect debated and considered for future actions, as it was deemed to be a key issue that future projects need to raise awareness about and focus on."

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.

Unable to assess

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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