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To the Editors:

Thank you for encouraging us to submit a revised version of our manuscript, ID 1521137416700581, “Development and Initial Testing of a Computer-Based Decision Aid to Promote Colorectal Cancer Screening for Primary Care Practice.” Attached to this letter is the following:

-A revised manuscript

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Jane Kim, MD, MPH
1. **Methods, ethical approval** - Any experimental research that is reported in the manuscript should have been performed with the approval of an appropriate ethics committee. Research carried out on humans must be in compliance with the Helsinki Declaration (<http://www.wma.net/e/policy/b3.htm>), and any experimental research on animals should follow internationally recognized guidelines. A statement to this effect must appear in the Methods section of the manuscript, including the name of the body which gave approval, with a reference number where appropriate.

The last sentence of the Statistical Methods section now reads, “Prior approval for the study was obtained from the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill Institutional Review Board, and the research was carried out in compliance with the Helsinki Declaration (<http://www.wma.net/e/policy/b3.htm>).”