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Reviewer’s report:

Participation rate is known to greatly contribute to the success of a mass screening programme. European randomized trials have demonstrated that a minimum of 50% participation rate was required to reduce significantly CRC mortality in the general population. In this context, assessing the impact of a new modality to promote CRC screening is relevant. The methodology used in this article is adequate. The paper is globally well written, even if some methodological points need to be clarified.

Minor essentials revisions

1-Abstract page 2:
a-In the Methods paragraph: it is not clear what the “usual care group” consists of. The authors should describe this option very shortly.
b-in the Conclusions paragraph: it is not clear what the authors mean by “compared to other patient-directed interventions for CRC screening”.

2-Introduction page 3
a-Is the reference 6 really relevant to justify CRC incidence reduction?
b-the authors should indicate what “VA” means before using the abbreviation.

3-page 6, in the Intervention paragraph:
a-I am sorry, but I was not able to find the appendix 1.
b-what does IRB mean? Please indicate what it is before using the abbreviation.

4-page 6: in the Cost Analysis paragraph:
a-I do not understand why the reference 23 has been introduced here to justify the point of view of the payer. This reference is related to the cost of a physical activity. Please find a more appropriate reference, if introducing a reference appears relevant to justify the study’s perspective.
b-the sentences “Thus, data collection for research purposes was not included in the analysis…….mailed reminder study” needs to be clarified. I do not understand the link (expressed by “thus”) between the choice of the point of view and the fact that economic data have not been collected. I also do not understand what the authors mean with “mailed reminder study”. This needs to be clarified.
c-to my opinion, the paragraph “overhead costs….. cost analysis” should be found in the paragraph entitled “costs of the intervention”. More globally, the description of economic parameters needs to be more consistent for the reader.

5-page 7: What does GI mean ? Please indicate what it is before using the abbreviation

6-page 8: The sentence “in addition to calculating….. promotion interventions” should be found in the Discussion section.

7-page 15: The authors indicate that costs and ICR were markedly lower. I agree, but comparisons were also quite difficult due to different target population and different promotion modalities. Please be careful in your conclusion and perhaps moderate it.

8-page 15: Given the fact that all details are given in the text concerning other promotions programs, I am not sure that the table 3 is required.
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