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Reviewer’s report:

Summary Statement

The purpose of the study is well stated and imperative to understanding who and how many people are being screened for specific cancers. Overall, this is a well written paper and is a good addition to the literature. This study uses a large nationally representative cross-sectional data set and appropriate statistical methods. The discussion and conclusions support the study findings and appropriate implications for the findings. My biggest concern with the paper is that the introduction could be strengthened. This and other minor concerns are addressed below.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The introduction only provides one reference and could be strengthened by providing a more informative background on what is already known about the topic. It would help to include some statistics or findings from previous studies that describe 1) what proportion of cancers diagnosed a year are breast, prostate, and colorectal cancers and 2) the ranges for the previous measures of screening attendance (even though the authors stated in the first sentence that the proportion of people who attend screening vary widely). If there is no existing literature about socio-economic and sociodemographic characteristics association with cancer screening in Australia, then perhaps discussing some common characteristics identified in countries where cancer screening is strongly advocated and practiced (U.S. or U.K.)

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Second sentence in the Methods, “Ascertainment of socioeconomic, demographic and health characteristics” section, did you mean “heart” instead of “other heard disease”?

2. First sentence of Results, “Descriptive statistics” section, paragraph needs indentation.

3. Maybe this is my misunderstanding but regarding odds ratios presented in Figures 1 & 2, why do some ORs not have confidence intervals shown around them while others do?
Discretionary Revisions

1. It may add to the discussion to suggest an explanation as to why individuals in rural areas had higher screening rates, than individuals in urban areas.
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