

Author's response to reviews

Title: Anticipating implementation of colorectal cancer screening in The Netherlands: a nation wide survey on endoscopic supply and demand

Authors:

Sietze T van Turenhout (s.vanturenhout@vumc.nl)
Jochim S Terhaar sive Droste (js.terhaar@vumc.nl)
Gerrit A Meijer (ga.meijer@vumc.nl)
Ad A Masclee (a.masclee@mumc.nl)
Chris JJ Mulder (cjmulder@vumc.nl)

Version: 3 **Date:** 30 December 2011

Author's response to reviews:

BMC Cancer

Amsterdam, December 2011

Dear Editor,

Respectfully we hereby would like to submit a revised version of our manuscript "Anticipating implementation of colorectal cancer screening in The Netherlands: a nation wide survey on endoscopic supply and demand".

We thank the reviewers again for the critical comments on our manuscript. Below, we have responded to the comments made by the reviewers. All changes are marked in blue in the manuscript.

We hope you will consider the revised manuscript for publication.

On behalf of the authors,

Yours sincerely,

Sietze van Turenhout

Response to reviewers

Editorial request:

Please correct reference 22.

We apologize for the missing surnames in reference 22. The reference is now correctly noted in the reference list.

Reviewer 1

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Page 5, Paragraph 3, define what exactly you mean by 'minimal endoscopic capacity' here.

The authors mean that by measuring current endoscopic production, the minimal endoscopic capacity is determined. The minimal endoscopic capacity corresponds with the production level what can be produced yearly. With more efficient use of existing resources endoscopic production might be raised, so that's why we called it "minimal endoscopic capacity". However, this might require to much interpretation so we changed 'minimal endoscopic capacity' by 'endoscopic production'. This topic is discussed in more detail in the discussion section, and we believe that a more extensive explanation is therefore not needed in the introduction section. We believe this change improves the readability of the paper.

Page 5: "On behalf of the Dutch Society of Gastroenterology, this study aims to update current endoscopic production and determine the trends in endoscopic procedures performed in The Netherlands since 2004."

Discretionary Revisions

1. Page 3, Methods section, 4th line: change 'determined' to 'estimated'.

This line is changed according to the suggestion made by the reviewer.

2. Page 3, Results section, 3rd line: change 'with' to 'by'.

This line is changed according to the suggestion made by the reviewer.

3. Page 4, Conclusions section, 3rd line: change to '... an estimated additional...'

This line is changed according to the suggestion made by the reviewer.

4. Page 4, Conclusions section, 3rd line: delete ',' after likely

This line is changed according to the suggestion made by the reviewer.

5. Page 5, Paragraph 2, 3rd line: change 'what' to 'which'

This line is changed according to the suggestion made by the reviewer.

6. Page 11, last line: change to 'The number of reported colonoscopies...'

This line is changed according to the suggestion made by the reviewer.

7. Page 12, Paragraph 2, 2nd line: delete 'of' before 78,000

This line is changed according to the suggestion made by the reviewer.

8. Page 14, Paragraph 3, 1st line: change to '... in the context...'

This line is changed according to the suggestion made by the reviewer.

9. Page 14, Paragraph 3, 1st line: change to ' ... Ireland and Romania have recent data been published.'

This line is changed according to the suggestion made by the reviewer.

10. Page 15, Paragraph 1, 10th line: change to '... lower than the production ...'

This line is changed according to the suggestion made by the reviewer.

Reviewer 2

Reading through cover letter and revised manuscript, I admit that the authors completely respond to issues I raised and correctly revised the manuscripts. There is no point in which revisions needed.