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Reviewer’s report:

In the present study, authors compare the CRC screening rates or screening awareness based on the patients self-report in US-national study. The authors show that those patients that usually visit “internal” doctors are potentially less likely to be aware of the screening colonoscopy, but at the same time do undergo CRC screening with either methods more frequently than those from “familial” doctors. I believe that this well-written report may be helpful for future improvement of cancer preventive strategies.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. Please revise the conclusion statement in the abstract. Since the study was designed to evaluate the self-reported awareness and personal adherence to the recommendations, I believe that there is not enough data to support the “failure” statement.

2. This is U.S. national-based study and the results may not be applicable to other countries. Please state this in the limitations.

3. I would strongly recommend adding following descriptions to the title of the paper: in United States and self-report.

4. According to the Figure 1, the patients were asked about the recent colonoscopy time point (<1, 1-2, 2-3 etc). The authors may wish to complete the information in the table.

5. Please include the characteristics and adherence to CRC screening for the disabled patients. What is the percentage of the disabled patients in this study?

Discretionary Revisions:

6. One of the main limitations of the study is the defined normal screening variable within five years and not as usually recommended 10 years. The authors may wish to elaborate more on that in discussion.

7. To simplify the understanding of the Table 1, this may be splitted into two tables separating characteristics and results.

8. The identification of the specialty of the usual care primary care physician may have strong biased overlap because of the self-reported context. The authors may wish to provide the numerical distribution of particular subjects regarding “greater number” of services prior to the assignment to FPs or internist.

9. To simplify the understanding of the Table 1, this may be splitted into two
tables separating characteristics and results.

10. The authors state in the discussion part that the CRC screening rate was lower than the national goal of 70%. Since CRC screening was defined within a 5-year time period and not as recommended within a 10-year period, this statement may be misleading.
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