

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Health System Response to Refugees' and Migrants' Health in Iran: A SWOT Analysis and Policy Recommendations

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Afona Chernet

Submitted on: 15 Aug 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1606268

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

Iranian healthcare system's response to the health need of migrants from Afghanistan using the SWOT analysis

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

did not consider the long-term of healthcare policy might have an impact on the outcome

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

major:

- for the sake of readability, please provide all the figures and tables mentioned in the manuscript in their respective positions.

for example, figure 1 is not included. Even in the supplementary material... please re-check

- your writing style is not consistent in regard to using the numerical presentation, such introduction of the appendixes, figures,s and tables numbers

for example

-line 157- you start with B, and where is A? Please introduce A first then B. Please be consistent in your writing...

- For the sake of readability, I think you need to revise your consistency of writing here in the main paper and in your supplementary materials.

detailed - minor:

titel - Refufees' - with apostrophes s

introduction - is not sufficient. please add more background info on

-Iran health care system

-Levesque framework - applicability or usability in other countries or setting

-line 25, clarify the def. and add for migrants, if possible

-line 28, no ref is needed here

-lines 30-33, you can remove the detail

-introduce SWOT, write it in full for the first time

-line 95-97, for some reason these websites are not accessible. please update the links

-line 100, use 'since' and not 'until'

-was the Afghan interviewee representative? for gender, education, age, employment, marital status, and other sociodemographics of the migrants...

-line 124- I think it is fine if you remove the initials of authors from all the documents... please check the other lines as well

- line 128- Appendix B? is not available? and where is A?
- line 129- Appendix? Where is it? and please follow the same pattern, either in letters or numbers.
- line 131 where is phase 1?
- phase 2 - please be consistent with the supplementary doc as well
- Phase A: Providing Health Services to Refugees: A Scoping Review
- line 148- where is Fig 1?
- line 157- you start with B, and where is A? Please be consistent in your writing...
- For the sake of readability, I think you need to really revise your consistency of writing here in the main paper and in your supplementary materials.
- in this format, it is difficult to follow your manuscript.
- please re-check the chronological order, and naming sequences of your writing style
- line 164 - you are jumping to Appendix B without introducing A. Where is A?
- Again where is phase 1? You can not present 2 without mentioning 1 first...
- such errors are repeating, please carefully look and re-writing your manuscript.
- line 167- Appendix A, should be mentioned first then B, and not vice versa
- line 178-181, please check and provide references
- line 226- ref 26, please move to the end of the sentence
- line 236-245, suits better in the recommendation rather than discussion. here you need to justify your findings

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

yes

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

need improvement

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

No.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

yes, but not sufficient. needs more in the background

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality



Q 10 Rigor



Q 11 Significance to the field



Q 12 Interest to a general audience



Q 13 → Quality of the writing

Q 14 → Overall scientific quality of the study

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 → Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.