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Major Compulsory Revisions

METHODS

1) Page 5 – What is the definition of a “geopolitical nationality group” and from what literature is this term derived? The authors focus on five such groups – sub-Saharan Africa, North Africa, Latin America, Eastern Europe and Asia – without explanation or rationale. Are these terms of convenience or are they the categories typically employed in Spanish government statistical or census data? Throughout the entire text the words “region,” “country,” “ethnicity,” and “culture” are often employed in indeterminate (or even interchangeable) terms that drain them of significance. Moreover, why these five groups and not immigrants from everywhere? If the authors’ exclusive focus is on immigrants from the developing world, then they should make that clear.

2) In terms of procedure (Page 5), the authors provide no specifics on the interview script, only that it was “based on the previous literature review.” Consequently, their analysis cannot be clearly evaluated nor can their study be reproduced or built upon by future researchers. This essential information (even if it is only the initial script) could easily be provided to the reader in a table or appendix.

DISCUSSION

1) Page 14 - The claim that “This paper explores three themes that emerged from the study data: 1) the migratory process, 2) beliefs and behaviors regarding sexuality, and 3) beliefs and customs during the reproductive process of female immigrants living in Andalusia.” directly contradicts their statement from Page 6 – “Interviews were structured around four sections: first, the story of the migration process. Secondly, sexuality. Thirdly, the reproduction…” These statements are completely incompatible.

CONCLUSION

1) Page 16 – This section is underdeveloped. Also, after focusing exclusively on the importance of studying immigrant females and SRH, the authors conclude by arguing for more research on the practices, beliefs and expectations of immigrant males. Given the weakness of their study sample, a more logical conclusion would call for additional work with a much larger, more representative sample of
the Andalusian immigrant female population to build upon this very preliminary analysis.

Minor Essential Revisions

ABSTRACT
Numerous mechanical and grammatical errors.

BACKGROUND
1) Page 3 – “… essential requirement for compliance with the Millennium Development Goals, recognized by major international organizations.” – this very specific claim requires attribution.

2) Page 3 – “At the same time, in today’s societies having large immigrant populations, the need for specialized health services for immigrants in host countries has been introduced in corresponding healthcare legislation” – this very specific claim requires attribution.

3) Page 5 – “Ultimately, despite some established measures, healthcare services in Spain are organized and created for a culturally, linguistically and socially uniform population. Cultural diversity, and the labor and social conditions of these users are not anticipated by the system. These situations produce inequality in access and use of healthcare services.” – is this the authors’ assertion or is this supposed to be attributed to Lobato and Oliver?

RESULTS
1) Page 10 – Eastern Europe is not a country.
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