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Reviewer's report:

General
1. Question posed was interesting and relevant.
2. The revisions made make this a very interesting paper

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Methods Para 7. The second sentence should be re-worded regarding the opportunity costs for NHS premises being zero. I think this is open to criticism as a sessional fee could have been included.
2. Results para 3 and Table 1. The non-attendees appear from the table of SIMD score to be "significantly" more deprived (p<0.0001). Is it possible to include as a footnote what SIMD stands for?
3. Discussion Para 7. The paper looks at screening costs and no mention is made of mortality differences and costs per life year gained. I think a discussion of cost effectiveness is not within the remit of this paper.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1. Some typos remain. (e.g. Abstract results 1st para "£15.72per man")
2. Abbreviations should be spelt out the first time as the readership may be international (e.g. Background para 2, US and UK)
3. Methods Para 5. It would be better to include the web site address as a reference

Discretionary revisions
1. Results Section. Is it possible to standardise the number decimal places for the data quoted?
2. Discussion para 2. I think a proviso should be included to admit that rural USA and rural Australia may not be comparable with rural Scotland.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No