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Author’s response to reviews:
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(Reviewer 1): The authors have been very responsive to the review. I have just a few relatively minor comments.
Thank you for your feedback. We appreciate the comments to help enhance the manuscript. Our comments to these new comments are below. We have made note of the changes in BOLD in this revision. We also accepted the changes from the last version.

1. In the abstract, the 6 recommendations for planning health fairs should be moved to the results section (as was done in the body of the paper).

We have moved the recommendations to the Results section on page 2 (Abstract).
2. Although the authors have clarified that the baseline survey was conducted before participants attended the fair events, it appears from the text (page 5) that participants provided information about screening behavior at the fairs on the baseline survey.

We are sorry for the confusion. The baseline surveys of participants were collected at the beginning of each of the health fair. This statement on page 5 is correct:

We conducted baseline surveys at the health fairs from May to September 2013 and conducted 6-month follow-up surveys through June 2014.

3. The sentence specifying that the authors attempted to conduct the process evaluation on half of the baseline participants is included twice (page 6).

We have removed this duplicate sentence.

4. How were participants selected to do the follow-up survey? Were they randomly selected from each site?

Yes, this is correct. We added these sentences to describe that process on page 6.

There was a random selection of 50% of baseline participants per site. These participants were comprised of both screening-eligible participants and non-screening eligible participants to get a breadth of responses. Non-screening eligible participants, or those who were adherent to screening, were asked to complete the process questions and were not asked about cancer screening.

5. Among the stated limitations (page 16) is that the sample was mostly white—however the majority (58%) of participants who completed the surveys were non-white.

This is a good point. We have removed that fact the participants were mostly White from that sentence as a limitation.

6. The manuscript should be reviewed for typographical and grammatical errors.

We have reviewed the article and made other changes in bold to improve the readability of the article and to correct any grammatical errors.