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To the Editor,

Please find attached the revised manuscript entitled, ‘Colorectal cancer screening knowledge, attitudes and behavioural intention in Indigenous Western Australians’ which was submitted for publication as an original research article in your journal, BMC Public Health. We have addressed the reviewer’s comments that were remaining from the last submission, point-by-point below.

We hope the comments have been sufficiently addressed to enable the manuscript to proceed for review. We look forward to receiving your response.

Regards,

Aliki Christou
and
Sandra Thompson
Reviewer's report

Title: Colorectal cancer screening knowledge, attitudes and behavioural intention in Indigenous Western Australians

Version: 3 Date: 4 June 2012
Reviewer: Peter O'Rourke

Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Page 38 table 5 n/a for the odds ratio for bowel cancer knowledge must be replaced by the actual odds ratios and their confidence intervals for medium vs low and high vs low. Corresponding text should be added to page 15.

   This has been completed. See Table 5 on page 38 and text on page 15.

2. Marital status has been excluded from the final model 1 in table 6 but the text on page 16 says that it is included.

   We were unable to find text on page 16 that says marital status was included in Model 1. It was only included in Model 2 and the text reflects this.

3. There needs to be more emphasis on the factors identified in multivariate analyses and correspondingly much less on the univariate factors from table 5. This change of emphasis needs to flow into the Abstract and Discussion. Specifically the Abstract Results should delete the univariate odds ratios and insert the multivariate ones.

   This has been carried out as suggested. Please refer to the abstract (page 1) and appropriate sections in discussion (page 18-20) and conclusions (page 24).

4. Table 4 perceived self efficacy has incorrect frequency for somewhat confident and all percentages are wrong.

   The frequencies and percentages have been cross-checked from the original data and corrected in the Table 4.

5. Page 10 line 15 should refer to table 3 not 4. Lines 18-19 need to correctly describe the handling of marital status in multivariate analyses.

   These have been completed as requested. Please see page 10 line 9 and line 12.

6. The authors might add small sample size to limitations as a partial explanation for the
very wide confidence intervals, particularly in multivariate analyses. An additional paragraph addressing this limitation has been added to page 24.
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