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A Systematic Review of Special Events to Promote Breast, Cervical and Colorectal Cancer Screening in the United States

Responses to Reviewer

Reviewer 1

1. The end of the first paragraph of the background is a little difficult to read with the various numbers and punctuation used. This could probably be streamlined for clarity. Also, are the cancer deaths expected or actual (given the year of report is 2009)?
We change the sentence on page 5 of the background to make it more easier to read. The number is expected deaths.

2. In the discussion, in the last paragraph (at the top of page 18), the authors indicate that looking to “grey literature” might be useful for this subject matter. Do they have any evidence that this is true?
We think this is true since many community organizations and/or health professionals may sponsor health fairs or other special events and present them at conferences or reports which are sources of grey literature. They may exist in those formats than be published in the scientific literature.

3. On page 15, the sentence reading “It is likely that articles included in this review represent those events that were documented and evaluated than most” seems to be missing a word or two. This sentence should be edited for clarity.
We have edited this sentence to make it clearer on page 15.

4. On page 16, the word changed should be replaced with change in the sentence reading “In this review, only one event reported a change in screening of 18% ....”
We have made this change.

Reviewer 2

1. Don’t repeat findings in the abstract conclusions, just draw conclusions.
We move the data from the results from the Conclusion section and just drew some conclusion statements in the Abstract.

2. The presentation of the conceptual model is not really supported by the review, or by the data from the review, and is not necessary to the review. It should be dropped from this manuscript.
We feel that this conceptual model is relevant to the understanding of the types of special
events and outcomes of interest for the articles that we reviewed (short term and intermediate outcomes.

3. On page 8 in the current version you should make a full list of the included outcomes by type of outcome. What actually was reviewed and included?

On page 9, we modified a sentence to give examples abstracted in the review. The longer listing of outcomes is found in the abstraction form (supplemental file).

4. Provide a sentence as to the reasons for ineligibility of the large number of ineligible articles.

On page 12, we added a sentence for the reasons for ineligibility.

(1) PRISMA guidelines: In accordance with BioMed Central editorial policies (http://www.biomedcentral.com/about/editorialpolicies#StandardsofReporting), could you please ensure your manuscript reporting adheres to PRISMA guidelines (http://www.prisma-statement.org/) for reporting systematic reviews. This is so your methodology can be fully evaluated and utilised. Can you please include a completed PRISMA checklist as an additional file when submitting your revised manuscript.

We have added a completed PRISMA checklist to the manuscript.

- We added the research questions on page 7-8.
- We added how we assessed individual study biases in the review process on page 11 to supplement the discussion of the rigor of articles found already on page 15.