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Reviewer's report:

This paper examined screening participation rate among relatives of colorectal cancer patients, who are at higher risk of CRC than those without familial history. This population-based study clearly defined asymptomatic subjects to exclude symptom-derived screening and calculated screening adherence according to risk strata.

Minor essential comments

1. Table 1.
   Age recommendation is not included for high risk individuals.
   It seems that age is not included in the original recommendation for this group. For the readers to easily understand, reference to age is necessary.

2. Methods & Results
   Eligibility of screening with regard to the relation of the dates between screening and diagnosis of the index cases is not described in the method.
   FDRs could not have chance of being recommended to have screening in accordance with the guidelines for at -high-risk subjects after index cases’ diagnosis.
   It is not clear whether screening undertaken before the date of an index case’s diagnosis was excluded or included in the analysis.
   Considerable proportion of FDRs had screening not along with recommendation.
   Brief description of distribution of segments within those individuals might be of help to the readers. For example, prevalence of segments that had screening a few years outside the recommended age range.

3. Discussion
   Discussion should be shortened.
   Page 19, 1st para. Screening rate among FDRs in accordance with the guidelines in this study is indeed much higher than the reported figures (i.e. 47 or 49% vs. 6%&1%). The author’s explanation on lower rate in the former study, (i.e. “the former study did not differentiate between CRC screening..."
undertaken in the absence or presence of screening”) appears to be incorrect. Including symptom-derived screening as well as real screening for asymptomatic individuals would lead to a higher rate than real screening rate. Should screening lead by symptoms be included in this study, the above figures would be further higher.

In any case, there are large differences in screening rates between the two previous studies cited and the present study.

The authors need to arrange the section (pages 19-20) to explicitly describe the findings from the present study in relation to the previous studies.
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