

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
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	Scoping Review

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript is highly relevant for the scientific community, addressing the significant but understudied healthcare service needs of refugees, asylum seekers, and residents with precarious immigration status in Canada. By synthesizing evidence from Canadian and global literature, it highlights systemic gaps and barriers to healthcare access, providing actionable insights for policymakers. The focus on equity-deserving populations (EDPs) ensures that the study contributes to improving health equity, social integration, and evidence-based policy reforms.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is suitable and accurately reflects the content and scope of the study. No changes are required.	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive and well-structured, summarizing the context, objectives, methodology, key findings, and conclusions effectively. However, it could benefit from a clearer delineation of the recommendations for policymakers and healthcare providers to emphasize actionable outcomes.</p>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p><b>Format Evaluation:</b> The manuscript does not conform to the expected structure for a scoping review, as outlined by PRISMA-ScR guidelines. Specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Lack of Standard Sections:</b> The manuscript should include clear sections such as Introduction, Methodology, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion.</li> <li><b>PRISMA-ScR Registration:</b> The study should indicate if it has been registered in a database like Open Science Framework (OSF).</li> <li><b>Study Descriptions:</b> A brief summary of each of the included studies is missing, which is a critical element of a scoping review.</li> <li><b>Duplicate Filtering:</b> The flow diagram indicates multiple exclusions of duplicates, suggesting an inconsistent methodology. Once duplicates are removed, they should not appear in subsequent stages of the analysis.</li> </ol> <p><b>Methodological Concerns:</b> The methodology description does not fully align with PRISMA-ScR requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Study Selection Process:</b> The diagram suggests issues with how duplicates and irrelevant studies were handled. This should be clarified and corrected.</li> <li><b>Individual Study Analysis:</b> There is insufficient analysis of the remaining 162 studies. A scoping review requires detailed categorization and individual evaluation of each study.</li> <li><b>Overemphasis on References:</b> References constitute a disproportionate amount of the manuscript, with 177 citations for a 11,679-word article. This accounts for approximately 50% of the text, which is excessive. Additionally, the bibliography should be reviewed and numbered for clarity.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p><b>References:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Volume of References:</b> While 177 references for 162 analyzed studies is reasonable, the proportion of references compared to the main text is excessive.</li> <li><b>Numeration:</b> References are not numbered, making it difficult to cross-reference citations. Numbering should be implemented for clarity and ease of verification.</li> <li><b>Repetition:</b> No duplicates were found among the references, but redundant citations should still be avoided.</li> </ol> <p>Adding a few references focusing on recent health policies or initiatives specific to Canada's refugee population would further strengthen the context.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is clear and appropriate for scholarly communication. Minor revisions are recommended to address typographical errors and improve sentence flow in some sections.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>To enhance the manuscript, the authors should consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript could benefit from a more detailed discussion of actionable steps for healthcare providers at the community level.</li> <li>2. Figures and tables are well-presented, but the text could better integrate these visual elements by referring to them explicitly in the narrative.</li> <li>3. The "Strengths and Limitations" section should elaborate on the limitations of the global literature comparison and provide suggestions for future research.</li> <li>4. The manuscript could expand its text content to better balance the extensive reference section.</li> <li>5. Extending the analysis to include individual evaluations of all included studies.</li> <li>6. Registering the study in an open repository for transparency and alignment with best practices in scoping reviews.</li> <li>7. Revisiting the flow diagram to eliminate redundancies and ensure logical consistency.</li> </ol> <p><b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b> Another way of continuing this article is simplifying the scope by focusing on a traditional review format that aligns with established methodologies. Also indicate adherence to selected PRISMA principles without claiming full compliance, given the current gaps in methodology and content.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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)</p>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Razvan Carciumaru</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of Oradea, Romania</b></p>