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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1) Sensitivity analysis was based on a 10% variation in point estimates. Better explanation is needed as to why this approach was selected.

2) Intervention costs in the results sections -- it is not clear exactly what costs are reported here. It is confusing to have time spent on various activities reported in this section. There is no mention of how time spent on activities were calculated in the methods section. Was a time-and-motion analysis used? Better explanation is required in the methods section to better inform the reader.

3) No details are provided on the timing as to when the FOBT kits were returned in the intervention and control groups. The reminder mainling was sent out 10 days after the kit and yet the return rate of FOBTs was calculated over a 6-month period. It would be good to know the when the FOBTs kits were returned (to understand the pattern of returns) in the intervention and control groups

Minor Essential Revisions

1) The 40% compliance rate with CRC screening recommendations referenced in the introduction is outdated. Need to update this reference with new data.

2) "In addition, the improvement in screening rates (should be rates) was about one half of what we observed in our study, and as a result, the ICER was much higher than what we report."

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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