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Reviewer’s report:

This paper describes the uptake of bowel and breast cancer screening among South Asian populations in the UK. The authors used data from 3 rounds of screening for each cancer type, and have huge sample sizes, allowing them to look at subgroups and interactions. The paper contains some very useful information on the factors which are influencing the lower rates of screening among these populations.

Compulsory revisions.

At 41 pages, with 117 references, 13 figures and 12 tables, the paper is far too long. There are a number of ways the paper could be shortened.

• The results are often presented separately for each screening round, when the findings are quite similar. If it is impossible to combine the three rounds into one analysis, then one set of results could be presented, with a note in the text that the results from other rounds were similar.

• Many of the figures could be omitted as much of this information can be deduced from the multivariate analyses or could be summarized succinctly in the text.

• Table 1 does not really add much and could be omitted.

• Table 2 is entirely described in the text and could be omitted.

• The introduction and methods could be shortened considerably, concentrating on the specific topics of the paper rather than giving details of each program.

• The description of the design of the paper could be written in full sentences, and much of the detail omitted.

• The results section on the univariate analyses could be compressed to only a few paragraphs.

• The section on screening outcomes could be shortened considerably as there are no really important findings.

• The discussion could be made less discursive and restricted to the main issues of the paper. In particular, the authors could concentrate on issues which are relevant to other jurisdictions and other programs rather than program-specific points.
• A complete restatement of all the findings in the conclusion is unnecessary. The conclusion should be limited to one short paragraph which contains the main message of the paper.
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