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Reviewer's report:

General

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Please clarify the following: The authors state that they sought out patients who had not been screened in order to explore barriers to screening. Then while they were looking for unscreened individuals they found some patients who actually had been screened and they then decided to include them to understand the facilitators to screening. There are two questions to be addressed: were the patients who had already been screened included as an afterthought or was the plan all along to get screened and unscreened patients. If the plan all along was to get screened and unscreened patients then why were not more equal numbers of each included? Finally, how much can really be learned about facilitators to screening when 7 patients out of 23 were screened and when 4 of the 7 had a colonoscopy for diagnostic reasons as opposed to screening.

In the discussion, the authors state that poverty and limited educational attainment may underlie the 4 major categories of barriers to screening. There are of course many factors that may underlie barriers to screening. Are there any data to support choosing these two factors? Might there be other explanations?

In the conclusion the authors state that low income as a barrier to screening is a particularly important dimension to explore. It is not clear from the data presented in the study, why this is a barrier to screening that is important to explore. Please clarify

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of
a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
could the interview instrument be made available to interested individuals eg on line

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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