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Response to reviewer’s comments  Thank you for the comprehensive review. Our responses, just below the reviewer’s comments (based) are as follows:

Gender Differences in the Health Belief Model Predicting Colorectal Cancer Screening Uptake: A National Study.

Reviewer 2 : Johannes Blom’s comments

In the Discussion, you need to expand the text when referring to, e.g., Canada so that the reader understands the generalizability of your results – how are the populations of the studies similar?

The health care system in Canada is very similar to that of Singapore where residents have access to public funded health care. In addition the study is conducted in Ontario which is urban and has a high incidence of colorectal cancer like Singapore. We have amended first 2 lines page 12, para 1 as follows:

“Like our study, the Canadian study was conducted in a relatively urban community with access to publicly funded healthcare and in a population with a similarly high incidence of CRC [22]. However, our screening rates are unacceptably low, when 73.3% of the eligible subjects had not gone for screening, despite the fact that nearly 90% were aware that screening helps detect CRC at an early stage which could be cured.”

Thank you for the included flow chart. I do miss the figures (no. of subjects) in each.

We have inserted the numbers for each box in the flow chart. As can be seen from the flow chart, there were 20 residents whom we were not able to contact even after 2 more attempts. We have decided to include them in the denominator of eligible residents. The response rate was thus 1763/ (1980 +20) ie 88.2%

Thank you.