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Author’s response to reviews:

Point-by-point response

Dear Prof. Balaam

Dear Prof. Mangrio

First of all, I would like to thank both reviewers for their helpful comments. Comments and suggestions were addressed and in our opinion the manuscript has improved. We hope that it will be considered for publication.

Kind regards

Nicole
Please see our responses after each comment:

Reviewer 1:

1.1 The migrants that you included were apparently from different kind of backgrounds and this would need to be discussed, since that could affect the results.

Thank you for this helpful comment. The point was addressed in the limitation section.

1.2 In the method, you mention that you analyzed the interviews according to an ethnographic investigation by Higginbottom 2016 and I would like you to clarify why you choose an ethnographic analytic method?

We clarified the meaning of the sentence. We used the same structure as Higginbottom et al. in their ethnographic investigation. This means that as we were conducting focus groups mainly in the hospital (and not in their usual setting), we didn’t use an ethnographic analytic method. We only used the suggested structure for data analysis of Higginbottom et al. in their study using ethnographic investigations.

1.3 It would be great if you could clarify how the analysis resulted in the headings that you have in the results to make it clearer?

Explanation was added.

1.4 Good discussion of the results, however I would like more discussion about the method. How did focus groups affect the ability among the informants to be honest and comfortable in the interviews?

Was added in the limitation section.

1.5 Migrants with different background such as either forced or voluntarily migration were included in the study, which I consider could affect the results. This might be needed to discuss.

More details were included in the discussion, but also the limitation section.

1.6 The sentence on page 13 and line 369-371, I do not understand how you by qualitative studies could compare different groups? Is it possible?
Sentence was clarified.

Reviewer 2:

2.1 However there are issues that need to be addressed to improve the article that need to be made before it could be published as indicated below. More generally it would be helpful to address more fully the issue of the diversity of the women you include in your study. You acknowledge that migrant women generally are diverse but you do not explore this fully, other than to mention undocumented women, yet your women come from a range of potentially very different backgrounds. Women's experiences are likely to vary based on time in the county, legal status and country of origin but you do not explore this, you cite Balaam et al 2017 but this article explores this issue specifically. This study/article could provide you with an opportunity to explore differences and similarities between 'migrant's women's experiences of maternity care in Switzerland this seems a missed opportunity.

Thank you for this helpful comment. I added explanation of the diversity of the migrants in the limitation section. Furthermore, I added few sentences of the sampling.

Specific issues to address:

2.2 * Methodology is very brief, are there specific issues with working with migrant women, why choose focus groups. Details of data analysis are also very brief and could be expanded. You rely on Higginbotham's paper for your analytic categories but say very little about this and why this is the model that you use.

Methodology was expanded and the use of Higginbothem’s model explained.

2.3 * Line 151 - you say women's status is in the table, I cannot see this. To outline in more detail the legal/migration status of the women you work with and their length of time in country would enrich your analysis.

The status was clarified.

2.4 * Line 149 - typo 'aving' should be 'having'

Thank you!
2.5 * Line 195 it would be helpful to explain what you mean by health literacy here this is the first time that you mention it.

Definition was added.

2.6 * Line 274 I am not sure why you make the distinction between perceived and real, if a women perceives it surely it is real to her.

Thank you. As the study didn’t access actual discrimination, wording was adapted.


Modified.

• * Line 290-304 This section on social support could be rewritten to be clearer

Thank you. This comment was very helpful. The section was rewritten and has hopefully improved.

• * The section on communication with health care professionals needs to be rewritten as it is a little repetitive.

Section was restructured and repetition suppressed.

Good discussion of the results, however I would like more discussion about the method. How did focus groups affect the ability among the informants to be honest and comfortable in the interviews?

Sentence was added in the limitation section.