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Reviewer's report:

The submitted article: “Evaluating the exposure to a rural community-based colon cancer screening program” describes the effect of an intervention aiming to increase the awareness of colon cancer prevention and screening and intention to consult a doctor about this.

It is a nicely conducted study written clearly

Some remarks:

The title is misleading, because this implies that the study was conducted to screening activities (like FOBT) and not “just” informing and raising awareness and increasing the willingness to see a doctor about this. So please change the title to a more appropriate one.

The authors are not consequent in the writing of numerers (4 and “four”). Make a choice.

The authors are not consequent in the notification of percentages, with or without decimals, use no decimals!

Something should be stated about the costs for the participants to the screening, which could influence attendance and willingness to visit a doctor.

The screening practice in the USA should be described (mainly FOBT at home, followed by scope??)

Page 1:
Define regularly (first paragraph last sentence)

Second paragraph,
the difference between the two mentioned studies is not clear , is that only the sigmoidscopy??

Were the scopes after FOBT testing?

The last sentence need a reference.

I understand for the readability of the paper that the abbreviations are mentioned in the chapter : Intervention” but normally the abbreviations are mentioned the first time the statement is mentioned (so on top part of page 3; HPRN, CBPR).
Page 4
What will be the first test which is used by the doctor? Is doctor a GP or can it be a health worker as well? By whom is the screening normally performed? FOBT testing at home?

Description of the population, number of primary care practices, etc should be made more clear (either in table or text)

Page 7
Why not asking for the test which was used?

What if persons differed on recall and recognition? One could not recall but recognise due to different sources than the components

Page 8
Add that p<.05 was considered as statistical significant

Results:
It is not clear whether 45% response rate was the 460 people, make this more clear

What did the weighing tell you?

Discussion

Previous testing is of great importance, this is related to the age of course, and the population described is by one third aged 40-49, persons who have little chance to be tested previously this should be mentioned somewhere in the discussion

The items in the newspapers are related, state that this is the most important issue and is an easy way to do, mugs are more work and have not really large influence so I would state that this should not be done.

The Harry Potter comparison is a bit strange and what does that say? In this age category…

If the authors what to leave this in please write “popular” completely

Bilingual information: was this also in the newspapers so?

What percentage of persons in the population under study does not speak English?

No information on family members with cancer or colorectal cancer/complaints was gathered, which could have influence the intentions and interest of the persons

Possibility for further research: determine the really screened percentage
Could the authors say something about the extrapolation of the findings to urban regions?

Conclusion: Minor Essential Revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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