Reviewer comment-2

The article can be rigorously strengthened by the following suggestions stated throughout each section of the paper.

Abstract
This paper aims to examine how the United States has implemented several policies to address immigration issues, and in particular policies that focus on undocumented immigrants. The authors mention that this paper draws from a larger mixed method study, however, this is not mentioned in the method section later in the paper. The authors discuss the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program which provides a two-year reprieve from being deported for a select group that was brought to the United States as children before they were 16 years old and have lived continuously in the United States since 2007. Authors share that during the COVID-19 pandemic, essential workers were on the frontlines of exposure in grocery stores as clerks, in healthcare settings, in restaurants, janitors, and in other positions that the nation needed to fill to keep society running during the pandemic. This qualitative study aims to examine the lived experiences of DACA recipients during the pandemic.

Introduction
The authors describe the background of DACA and provided some context of DACA during COVID-19.
The authors should be mindful of using citations throughout the text. For example, there is no citation connected to this claim. “The COVID-19 pandemic increased stress and hardships for migrant families. They are more likely to live in multigenerational homes and work in crowded settings with poor ventilation.” The lack of citations throughout the introduction/background section is concerning. In addition, a paper such as this warrants a section that defines the research questions and also should contain (a) a synthesis of findings in a “state-of-the-knowledge” summary; (b) an identification of gaps and limitations in the literature as well as a clear discussion of how further research should extend, differ from, or replicate past studies and an articulation of the intended study should be included.

Methods & Study Design- The authors should define the research questions that guide this study. The authors should also clarify the methods; it seems as though this is a mixed method study but it is not clear as the authors stated, “This is a qualitative study of 12 DACA recipients’ interviews who were first recruited through the survey they completed and 60 DACA-eligible survey responses.” I am confused by the reference that the authors made to a “survey.” The authors state that they conducted a phenomenological research study but do not provide rationale or citations for why they selected this method to capture DACA recipients’ experiences as well as factors contributing to their experiences. At times the authors refer to a survey so it needs to be more clear that this is possibly a qualitative paper that has come out of a mixed method study. This section lacked a thorough and step by step discussion of the data analysis process; all that was mentioned was that they used Content Analsysi.

Findings

This section need significant work. The results should relay the primary themes abstracted from the coding process, and should not remain at the level of description only (unless the study is purely descriptive). Authors should point out complexities within the results and when possible, point out the unexpected or surprising findings. In this study, the results section header is "Survey findings." This is not an appropriate header for a qualitative study. A descriptive table should be provided that presents a clear overview of who the sample population was for this study. The tables that were included were ineffective, not effectively labeled, and illegible as the graphics were extremely small and did not provide a clear picture to view. There is only one header "essential yet denied" and no other sub headers were included. The article should present the main themes and include subsections that relate back to the analysis of findings.

Discussion & Conclusion

The authors did not provide an appropriate discussion. There is a lack of synthesis on the relevance of the findings nor is there a tie back to the theoretical framework. The authors should synthesize the findings into summative statements and discuss how the findings fit within existing literature. They should also discuss the extent to which conclusions are consistent and congruent with the data; that is, are the conclusions based on strong, moderate, or weak evidence. The authors should describe the ways in which the findings contribute to the knowledge base and the implications of the findings for practice, research, and/or public policy. The authors should discuss the strengths and limitations of the methodology (see below); which was not done for this section.

The limitations section must be strengthened this section should include sufficient detail and description to make the research process transparent to the reader. This section mentioned that 72 participants were included in this study yet the methods section described that only 12 participants were interviewed yet also referred back to the survey conducted. Please make sure your sample is written more carefully above in the methods section. Strengths and limitations of the article should be assessed with a qualitative framework of: credibility, transferability, auditability, and confirmability. This manuscript does not include any of these items.

New directions for research and practice should also be provided. This section would benefit from the use of headers that could help organize this section and should describe implications for policy and practice. Later in the Implications section, the sample is referred to as "60 participants" which is different than the sample stated above of 12 participants and at times referred to as 72 participants.