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Reviewer’s report:

Regarding Revision 1 of : CanPrevent: A telephone-delivered intervention to reduce multiple behavioral risk factors for colorectal cancer.

Major compulsory revisions.

1. The authors have revised considerably the manuscript in response to the reviewer suggestions. While the majority of issues have been appropriately addressed, the primary concern that this reviewer identified previously has not been changed sufficiently in my opinion. Perhaps it was not stated explicitly enough in the initial review. This pertains to an overemphasis on the "statistical significance" of the findings. I had previously recommended that you either: (a) show effect sizes, (b) control for baseline, or (c) simply show the data as pre and post without any tests of significance. You have chosen to disregard this suggestion and have continued to show p-values for the numerous tests that were conducted and have touted the significant findings. Given that this is a feasibility study; I believe it is your prerogative to show the p-values but I also believe you should recognize the limitations of your study and scale back on how much significance you can claim from these results. Consequently, I would strongly suggest that you do a search throughout the manuscript and delete any reference to “statistically significant” or “significant.” I have no problem with your stating that “from baseline to six weeks, improvements were observed for x, y and z” or that “participants were more likely to meet these guidelines”. Leave it to the readership to decide how significant these changes are given the caveats of this study. This is a very fine piece of work with some compelling results; I would not want to put people off by creating an impression that you are overstating your results. I would take a conservative approach and let the data sell itself.

Minor issues not for publication: Please consider another word for “trailing”. Not sure if that is a word. Clinical “trial” is a noun or adjective. I have never seen trial used as a verb. There is one remaining “trialled” on page 4. Please consider revising. Again, my apology if this is an issue of differences in language across countries.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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