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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has improved somewhat in clarity and presentation. There are still a number of points which require further revisions.

Page 2, third paragraph, fourth sentence: Full stop after reference 11. Start next sentence with 'Thus' instead of 'since'. Delete 'in this case' after additionally

Page 2, last sentence: Provide a reference for the following statement ‘...because nurses usually devote more time than other professionals to health education activities’.

Page 3 first sentence: please describe the aim of the larger study.

Page 3 second paragraph: should this be 115,867 participants rather than inhabitants?

Page 3 third paragraph: sample size is usually calculated on the difference in proportions between two groups rather than one proportion. Please clarify.

Page 3 fourth paragraph: All professional completed the questionnaire during a clinical session? Please explain this further.

Page 4, third paragraph: should this be categorical and continuous variables rather than qualitative and quantitative?

Page 4, third paragraph: please expand further on the categories No and don’t know? In Table 3 there are some variables that contain a ‘no’ category, and some that only have a ‘don’t know’ category.

Page 4 last paragraph and Page 5 first paragraph: please add these results to Table 1 as it is unclear if the percentages given in the text are comparing doctors and nurses or FOBT and colonoscopy.

Page 5 second and third paragraphs: add these results to Table 2.

Page 5 last two paragraphs: I am still concerned that the analysis was not adjusted for profession as clearly there are significant differences between doctors and nurses in many of the variables reported in Tables 1-3. Also it is still unclear to me if all the variables in Table 4 were entered simultaneously into one model or one by one in separate logistic regression models. If all simultaneously please remove the horizontal lines between the independent variables. In addition Table 4 seems to enter new independent variables not reported in Tables 1-3 or the text, for example how easy it is to perform the FOBT and the
sensitivity of the FOBT. Please add these variables to Table 1-3.
Table 5 seems to be a replication of Table 4, pls delete.
Page 6, paragraph 2, please give a reference for the National Cancer Strategy.
Page 6, paragraphs 3, 4, and 5, please critically revise these paragraphs as they are not very clear at present.
Page 6 last sentence: should this be other?
Page 7 first paragraph: please add these data to the Tables or omit from discussion.
Page 7 fourth paragraph: sentence ‘... especially since nurses appear to be more familiar than physicians with how the FOBT.’—this sentence is incomplete and it is also not supported by the data presented, which shows that nurses have knowledge deficits and wish to obtain more training on CRC and screening.

Tabel 1: replace all semicolons with dots
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