

Review of: "Forget the cake: let them work. Conflicting narratives towards work, health and the plight of asylum seekers in the UK"

Andrew Wright

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an interesting discussion of a policy inconsistency in the UK, in a topical area of great import.

As the article is primarily highlighting policy inconsistency, I suggest that there would be benefit from directly quoting and referencing policy documents/statements from UK Government to compare and contrast. As well as proving greater weight to some of the statements within the article, this may provide insight into potential cause of the inconsistency. For example, it seems plausible that the inconsistent policy position could be caused by 'silos' within the UK Government apparatus - with policymakers in the Department for Work and Pensions' objective to reduce welfare reliance and increase work and the Home Office more concerned about immigration.

While reading the article I also wondered if there is any information on other barriers for the migrant cohort caused by UK government policies. For example, in Australia, there have been issues with migrants having their overseas qualifications recognised for use in the country.

There is also a slight typo in the conclusion stating that highest level Universal Credit sanctions can last 91 days – a first higher-level sanction is 91 days. Second and subsequent sanctions are even more stringent at 182 days without benefit.