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Reviewer’s report:

Authors must respond –

1. The "sampling bottle" condition is contaminated with an interpersonal intervention. The manuscript reports that this condition, sampling bottles, also receives more detailed explanation, in the form of an interpersonal exchange, either f2f or via telephone. Hence, this is not just a different device/bottle, but also a personal assistance and contact (see p. 6). "Participants who receive sampling bottles are given more detailed instructions for stool collection via telephone or face to face by research staff, since participants are unfamiliar with the stool devices" – please clarify if there is also a conversation with the "stool container" condition, and if so, conduct time measurement in a subsample of participants. The interpersonal contact or its length may act as a contaminator or a moderator.

2. The authors present a sound rationale for an expected difference in the primary outcome due to study's conditions. No hypotheses or rationale for expected difference between the study conditions in the secondary and tertiary outcome and are presented. It's most striking for the tertiary outcome (p. 7) of test’s results (positive/negative). I wonder: do the authors expect that more healthy (or sick) people will respond more to one of the conditions?

3. The results of the satisfaction and intention to re-screen can be analyzed by ANOVA, as the dependent variables are continuous. No need to collapse it into 2 or 3 categories, as data will be lost.

The author can be trusted to make these:

There is inconsistency in the tense used. Sometimes the report is in the future tense, and sometimes in the past tense.

The authors may consider:

Think about the idea of pre-stamped envelopes for returning the test.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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