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Reviewer's report:

This systematic review summarizes the literature on refugee perceptions of the Australian healthcare system. I think that the review and the synthesis were conducted thoroughly and the paper reads well. I have only minor comments that might improve the quality of the paper.

Abstract:

The abstract reports that "Titles and abstracts of 1444 articles" were screened. However, this is not consistent with the flow chart.

The results section and the conclusion section should be a bit more directly linked. The conclusion section starts with "Refugees face significant barriers in accessing and engaging with healthcare services and often resort to familiar means to overcome what is unfamiliar", however the results section does not indicate that this was the main finding.

Introduction:

I suggest that the authors explain in the introduction section why they focused only on studies published between the years 2006 to 2018.

Furthermore, they need to explain why they focused on Australia only.

Discussion:

I suggest that the authors offer more comparison of their findings to existing literature from other countries.

In addition, they might want to indicate how their results may have implications for other countries as well.
Given the fact that this is not an Australian journal but rather an international journal, a stronger focus on other countries should be useful.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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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?
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