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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Dear BMC editorial team,

Thank you very much to the reviewers for their comments to out manuscript. Please find below responses to the comments. All suggested modifications are shown in track changes.

**Reviewer 1**

Comments:

The manuscript is clear and well structured, there are a number of limitations, as stated by Authors themselves but it address a very relevant issue in matter of PH. Results and conclusions are consistent and recommendation are relevant and valuable.
In my opinion the manuscript may benefit from a much shorter and less structured discussion that, as it is, is somehow redundant with results.

Response:

In response to the reviewer comments, we have removed redundancies from the discussion section where we felt this was possible. After discussion with the co-authors, we would like to keep some of the summarised results in the discussion, as we believe that this will make it more convenient for the reader to put the discussion on the context of our findings.

Reviewer 2

Comments:

The authors aimed to assess screening frequency in documented and undocumented pregnant migrants in Denmark and to compare prevalence of HBV, HIV and syphilis infection in these 2 groups. They found that pregnant undocumented migrants had a poorer chance of being tested for HIV, HBV and syphilis, despite having a higher prevalence (at least for HBV infection) than documented ones.

The paper is very interesting and well-written.

My only minor criticism is the statistical analysis which is poorly described in the appropriate section. In fact, the authors state: "We calculated median gestational age at first visit including the interquartile range". Is the choice of median (rather than mean) due to a non-Gaussian distribution of the variable?

Response:

We have incorporated an addition in the methods section that gestational age at first visit was not normally distributed, as a justification for calculating median age rather than mean age.

Editorial requests:

Declarations: We have adopted the structure as in the style guide, and as part of that we have

- Put the list of abbreviations, competing interests, authors contributions and acknowledgements as subheadings under declarations
- Moved the “Protection of humans subjects” statement from the methods section to “Ethics approval” under the declaration heading; we have added the ethics approval reference number to the ethics section.
• Added a statement on the availability of the data. The data is not publicly available as it is extracted from medical records for a vulnerable population.

We thank you for considering the publication of this paper and look forward to hearing back from you.

With best regards,

Annika Wendland