Reviewer’s report

Title: Quality of health care for refugees - a systematic review

Version: 0 Date: 01 Feb 2019

Reviewer: Reviewer 2

Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: This is a systematic review of the literature to identify quality indicators for healthcare for refugees. The authors found over 100 indicators but only from half a dozen sources. It looks like the methodology of this review is robust enough to merit publication, but I have highlighted a number of issues that require addressing in order to add further clarity to the review.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Introduction

- Stronger rationale is needed for why QIs are needed for refugees. Why can't existing healthcare QIs be used?

Methods:

- How exactly was the grey literature search conducted? Were any grey lit databases used?

- I have some reservations about the PubMed search strategy. Why was the word "refugees" not searched as "refugee*" and "asyl* seek* as per the Web of Science search?

- Was the search strategy consulted on by a medical librarian?

- "This systematic review was independently performed by two screeners" - do the authors mean, certain stages of the review were conducted independently, such as title/abstract screening, full text screening, and data abstraction?

- Why were publications limited to Eng/Ger/Fre? How many studies in other languages could have been included in this review without this restriction?

- What does "Primary source of QI?" mean. Presumably this is something about primary/secondary research papers? Can the authors give an example of what might be excluded?
"The described indicators had to be specific and measurable" - how was this defined by the authors?

It's not clear what the following statement means: "In a second step, all publications were excluded that identified QIs regarding health care for refugees but did not have a reference to health care."

Results

- It is not too conventional to cite the full texts that were screened but not included in the review. Can the authors justify why this was done?

- What is meant by "indicator evaluations" and "whole indicator sets"? These should be defined in the methods.

- What is the difference between indicators of integration and of acculturation? How was this categorisation decided upon?

- Did the authors consider the frequency of indicators from different sources if there was more than one of the same?

Discussion

- There appears to be a lack of insightful discussion as to the findings of the review - do the authors think these 155 indicators are useful? Are they too many? Or too little? Is the focus on reproductive health appropriate for the current health burden of refugees?

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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.

No
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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