

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Working conditions and self-reported health among undocumented and newly regularized migrants in Geneva: A cross-sectional study

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Afona Chernet

Submitted on: 26 Sep 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1606394

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

work-related factors are more important health risk factors than legal status for undocumented migrants and newly regularized migrants

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

- shortage of time
- diverse response from participants

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.

line 23_migrant workers are

line 56-57_contradiction between the 1st and 2nd reason, please re-consider

line 61_would you suggest for ref.?

line 74_ why is the reference anonymized? same line 85 and others. Any explanation?

in 'data source'_ the written consent of participants needs to be mentioned somewhere around here

line 101_ as it will be used for abbreviation, how about writing it as, 'Self-Rated Health', for the sake of readability

line 131_ Do you mean 8-12, right? please check it.

line 131_ Could you please introduce 'Cronbach's alpha' briefly?

line 135_ similar as above, preferably to write it in full, as 'self-rated health'

line 213_no need an 'a' before OR. Similar to others as well ...

line 223_ It is better to use the full name, as 'self-rated health' please. Use the abbreviation, only when needed, and it is not wrong to use the full name as well. Sometimes, it is preferable to present it in full, such as in the discussion, and conclusion parts.

line 229_why are some references anonymized? any explanation would be helpful

line 309_ use the full name, please

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?

yes

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

Yes.

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

the 'anonymized' references need to be supplemented, as commented above

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:

Minor revisions.