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Reviewer's report:

This paper by Soin et al. focuses on the "inappropriate" application of fecal occult blood test (FOBT), which is the most important test in colorectal cancer (CRC) screening, and is often included as the first step in a screening protocol due to its cost-effectiveness and non-invasiveness.

I would like to suggest minor points to consider in subsequent version:

* Table 4; "inappropriate" column: "225 patients aged <75 years". As written in the paper, according with the American Cancer Society Colorectal Cancer Screening Guidelines (ACS) (January 2018), the appropriateness of FOBT considered as one criterion age from 50-75 years. Thus, probably Authors would like to write "225 patients aged >75 years".

* You have written in the article: "This study also highlights the burden of unnecessary procedures as a result of the inappropriate FOBT testing" and it could be absolutely true but it is not clearly demonstrated in your study. It would be interesting to know how many patients still have the indication to undergo a colonoscopy (or imaging tests to look for CRC) in the "potentially-inappropriate" group, despite the positive result of FOBT. Indeed, It is important in a cost-effectiveness point of view to not perform inappropriate FOBT but It is important to consider in your study if the positive result of FOBT surely increases the number of subsequent procedures.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
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