

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_129377
Title of the Manuscript:	Healthcare service needs for refugees, asylum seekers, and residents with precarious immigration status in Canada: A scoping review
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of paramount importance to the scientific community as it addresses a critical and underexplored area: the healthcare service needs of refugees, asylum seekers, and residents with precarious immigration status in Canada. By conducting a thorough scoping review of the last decade's data, it sheds light on the unique healthcare and social vulnerabilities faced by these equity-deserving populations. The findings underscore the pressing need for targeted, culturally competent healthcare policies and services to ensure equitable access and improve overall health outcomes. This study contributes valuable evidence that can guide policymakers, healthcare providers, and researchers in bridging gaps and fostering inclusion in healthcare systems.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and clearly reflects the content of the manuscript. However, if you want to make it more precise, you could consider adding a specific keyword related to the primary methodology or outcome of the study.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract effectively summarizes the main objective, methodology, and key findings of the study. However: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider briefly mentioning the specific implications of the study results to enhance clarity. Remove redundant details that can be addressed in the full text. Suggested edits for the abstract: [Provide specific suggestions, e.g., "Add a sentence about the impact of the study findings on future research."]	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is scientifically sound, with no major errors identified in the methodology or interpretation of results. Ensure that any claims made in the conclusion are fully supported by the data presented. Additional comments: [State any specific observations about the methods, results, or discussions that might need clarification.]	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most references are relevant and recent. However, there are opportunities to strengthen the literature review by including more recent works in the past 3–5 years that align with the study topic.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<input type="checkbox"/> The language is suitable for scholarly communication. However, some sections might benefit from minor grammatical revisions for better readability. <input type="checkbox"/> Consider revising overly long sentences to improve clarity.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nagib Mahfuz Sunny
Department, University & Country	Trine University, United States