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Reviewer's report:

The article is well written, the question is well defined and the methods well described. The results are presented quite clearly.

There are some minor revisions required:

1. Page 4 EPHI standards, instead of EBHI.
2. In the presentation of Results. Development of List of Criteria section (pag 9): "single criteria were grouped into to seven categories" correct to "single criteria were grouped into seven categories"
3. Still in page 9, "single criteria were grouped into to seven categories", the category "formal issues" is erroneously listed twice.
4. In the Discussion section is stated that "The final manual-based list of criteria contains 230 criteria in seven categories". It was previously mentioned that the seven categories were further aggregated into four domains, it is not clear to me if this is an error in the text, or if the manual actually grouped the criteria in the 7 categories and not the 4 domains.
5. Table 2, page 29, it is not clear the difference between the two criteria n. 15 "The disease risk compared to other cancer disease risks is stated" and n. 16 "The disease risk compared to that of other types of cancer is stated". They both sound the same to me, requiring the material to compare the risk of colorectal cancer to the risk of other cancer types.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.