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Reviewer's report:

Please consider these comments below that may be able to help the authors.

The purpose of the manuscript was to develop a list of comprehensive criteria to evaluated health information on colorectal cancer screening. It presents a sequential compilation process and included expert advice to create the final list. This work does have implications for the field of cancer screening and education. Due to lower rates of screening for colorectal cancer globally, provision of quality health information on screening may assist in raising population awareness and understanding of the cancer and screening tests, ultimately increasing screening rates.

I would at least give the manuscript a minor revisions to improve on it as a possible manuscript of interest.

The abstract is fairly clearly written.

Introduction

Context of colorectal cancer in Germany would be desirable on p. 5. What are the screening rates and how does it compare to other countries or rates in Europe overall; are there differences in screening by tests since the assessment rates 2 different testing modalities?

Methods could improved in the following manner:

- outline who conducted the data
- methodological considerations section on page 6 is not written as a narrative; perhaps this should be presented in a table - pp.10-13, examples of the rating by criterion are offered; may want to reduce of these examples - how were the criteria discussed by the panel and determination made on criteria to keep; more details about instruction given would be helpful - p.16, Table 5 presents ratings of materials (13) by these criteria but we observe that most items related to risks and benefits of screening are not reported; what are the implications of those findings - do print materials have to be augmented with patient education/informed decision making since the materials fail to offer this information

Implications

The Discussion could be much improved. Does this assessment offer guidance
for health educators developing print education on cancer screening?

Several limitations are presented throughout and a focus on implications of the criteria and its utility for the field of cancer education would be valuable to understand; what are areas of further research

Research: Further refinement of items perhaps by ratings and interrater reliability analysis may be warranted? Does the assessment of the criteria need further testing and validation?

Use: Who is best suited to use these ratings? Should panels review materials and provide feedback and list quality colorectal materials for public use on a website? What if most print materials are scored poorly--what is the consequence of that - small media needs to be supplemented by one on one or group education to promote screening? informed decision making? Practical implications would be helpful

Table 1 presents a nice summary of the domains for the criteria; it is fairly detailed; how detailed do colorectal cancer materials have to be in order to address most of the criteria in the specific content areas; most educational print material are fairly concise so the inclusion of these materials may suggest longer print educational materials; would this have implications for designing educational materials

Figure 1 presents a succinct flowchart of the methods; however usually systematic reviews present articles/documents found at each stage; consider making these additions