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Reviewer's report:

Overall, an interesting article on small scale rural-rural migration.

A visual indication of describing migration patterns could be useful to emphasise and support the introduction, and help to indicate who the migrants and non-migrants are to this region. In general, it is unclear which characteristics and differences exist between migrants and non-migrants throughout the work, and it could be useful to provide a clearer theoretical distinction between migrants and non-migrants in this context.

86

Ref [8] suggesting migrants tend to earn lower incomes is very old. What is the current evidence to support this argument?

86-87

The subsequent comment that "Migrants are often not seen as part of a community" also needs to be clarified. Which community does this refer to?

88

Are there significant language barriers and significantly different cultural norms between migrants and non-migrants in this context? What is the evidence to suggest this is the case.

96-97 (& Conclusion 469-70)

It could be useful to suggest more specifically how findings from this work could be used to inform policy and programmatic interventions. For example can the findings be integrated directly into policy guideline documents or for intervention tools?
It would be useful to define the meaning of saturation here - what does it mean in this context and how has it been achieved?

With regards oversampling, I could be useful to indicate the relative weight in the general population, and provide a relative comparison.

Snowball sampling used, but it's not clear precisely which populations were particularly difficult to reach for the study and why? Please elaborate.

What constitutes a long term resident in this context? Overall, it would be ideal to have a clearer idea of the characteristics of those recruited both to focus groups and key informant interviews - ie, in relation to gender, age, length of time resident in the area & accordingly whether migrant or non migrant.

Great to see consent being adhered to with regards recordings, but were differences between how the data is handled/analysed with regards recorded and non-recorded interviews that could affect results reported?

Please provide an indication of the proportion.
Did the uninhabited homes coincide with any particular seasonal factors? Any suggestion of whether the uninhabited homes would be those of migrants to or from the region, and would the residents be returning?

194

Was the oversampling mentioned in 119 focused on migrants?

240-2

A little confusing that more migrants treated their water and higher wealth index associated with increased water treatment - how true is the suggestion that migrants are less wealthy in this case (suggested in wealth index 306-9)?

Discussion of water interesting from KI, but their comments suggest that the water in the region is unsafe for drinking - how accurate is this suggestion?

264 (&433-440)

Migrants living closer to medical treatment site. Please explore whether there are any specific reasons for this.

272-280

It's unclear whether the respondents are considering this for each age group, or whether respondents have been categorized by age group to give responses - please clarify.

321

Were both migrants and non-migrants joining safety committees, please clarify

395

More citations could be useful
More detailed discussion of access to and treatment of water could be interesting here, particularly with a few refs.

Did both migrants and non-migrants attribute their lack of safety to migrants - would be interesting to discuss

Maybe interesting to discuss difference in rates as well as amounts of land ownership for migrants and non-migrants here

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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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.
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