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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript shows the results of the current state of colorectal cancer (CRC) screening in Singapore and the barriers and facilitators towards this screening using the Health Belief Model.

CRC is one of the most incident cancers worldwide. Because it is difficult to change some habits, screening is the best option to prevent CRC and so it is very important to identify factors associated to screening uptake.

In order to improve the quality of the manuscript some changes should be done, most of them are minor except the discussion section which needs a major compulsory revision.

General comments
Authors should read the BMC Public Health general guideline in order to assure that all sections are included:
Introduction section should be replaces by Background section.
A list of abbreviations should be provided. It is not necessary to abbreviate “Computerized Tomographic” (in the Background) because it only appears once. The individual contributions of authors to the manuscript should be specified (in the Authors’ contribution section).

References have to be cited following this format: Title. BMC Public Health [year], [volume number]:[article number].

English should be revised because there are sentences and words which are not suitable. It is difficult to understand some parts of the manuscript.

Background
It would be interesting to know the situation of CRC screening in Asia (for example if there are population based CRC screening programmes).
In the last paragraph, objectives are not clearly stated.

Methods
There are some questions unclear:
How many interviewers conducted the survey?
CRC screening behaviour: it is necessary to explain a little bit more this point.
Was it possible to answer more than one screening option? What happened if the interval of FOBT, sigmoidoscopy or colonoscopy was higher?

In the second paragraph after “Survey questionnaires” authors mentioned that subjects with a personal history of CRC, adenomas or inflammatory bowel disease are at a higher risk of CRC and would not be considered screening candidates. People with hereditary or familial CRC should not be considered neither but there is no mention about this.

Results

The authors say that the response rate was 86%, how is it calculated (numerator and denominator)?

It would be interesting to know the reasons of refusal.

The percentage of female (60.4%) is not correct concerning the results included in the table (1,050 women and 693 men # 60.2% female)

Table 1:
The period (years) included in the title is not correct
Include the n and % in each result and the p value instead of the total.
The sum of percentages of each category should be 100%.

Table 2:
Include the n and % in each result.
Identify significant results (bold, italic…)

Table 3:
It is very extensive, which makes it difficult to follow the results. It is necessary to change the format in order to make it more attractive to readers.
Include the n and % in each result.
Identify significant results (bold, italic…)

Table 4:
It would be interesting to see all the results (significant and no significant, identifying the significant in some way).

Figure 1
Put the numbers in the same format (with one decimal).

Figure 2
An alternative title: Reported symptoms of colorectal cancer
Put the numbers in the same format (with one decimal).

Discussion

The main results are discussed but should also be compared with other studies. In Europe, some studies have been conducted with similar results to those in the manuscript. It is necessary a more comprehensive literature search.
References
References have to be cited following the BMC Public Health format.
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