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Reviewer's report:

This paper has some potentially useful information; however, some important details are lacking, and there seems to be little support for the conclusion. Specific comments follow.

1. Abstract
   a. The evaluation also included interviews with the health fair coordinators—this should be included in the methods.
   b. The planning recommendations, which apparently were based on data from health fair coordinator interviews as well as participant surveys, should be reported in the results section.

2. Background: What were the specific questions that the evaluation was designed to answer?

3. Methods
   a. Please provide further details on the grants process. How were the grants announced? Who was invited to submit an application? How were successful applicants selected? What funds or other assistance did the grants provide to the 5 grantees and the 2 additional health fairs?
   b. Please provide more details on participant recruitment. How and when were health fair attendees invited to participate in the study? Who invited them—study staff or health fair personnel? How and by whom was informed consent obtained? Did participants complete the baseline survey before or after they attended health fair activities?
   c. Please provide more details about the baseline survey. What factors related to cancer screening did the survey include—were barriers to screening assessed? Did the baseline survey ask about screening history or screening received at the health fair or both?
   d. The text states that the authors collected data from health fairs occurring from July 2013 to June 2014, but Table 1 indicates that one health fair was in May 2013, 2 were in July 2013, and 4 were in September 2013.
e. Please provide more details about the interviews with health fair coordinators. How long after the health fairs did they take place? What kind of feedback on the evaluation was solicited?

f. The response options should be specified for the ratings items and behavior questions on the follow-up survey.

g. Did the follow-up survey ask whether or not participants received screening after the health fair?

h. What method did the research team use to come up with recommendations for the design of health fairs?

4. Results

a. It would be helpful to know what types of organizations produced the health fairs, whether or not they had previous experience, and to what extent there was community involvement in planning and conducting the health fairs.

b. The number of participants who completed the baseline survey and the number who completed the follow-up survey should be reported in the text.

c. The sentence about demographic characteristics pertaining to the majority of participants needs to be restated: most of the proportions are less than 0.5 and therefore are not a majority.

d. At baseline what proportion of participants had never been screened (as appropriate for their age and gender), or were overdue for screening?

e. The text states that 80% of participants rated the health fairs as an important factor in their decision to get screened—was the denominator all participants, or those who decided to be screened? What proportion of participants decided to receive each type of screening (among those of an appropriate age and gender)? What proportion reported being screened at the health fair and during the follow-up period?

f. Why do the authors state that participants were less satisfied that the location was convenient? The mean rating was high and similar to that of other health fair characteristics.

g. The text states that some labs provided support for expenses of genetic testing for cancer—what tests were those?
h. Another limitation is that participants may not remember very much about the health fairs 6 months later.

5. Discussion
   a. The fact that 37% of participants were uninsured does not mean that the fairs reached 37% of the uninsured.
   b. It would be helpful to have some discussion about the range of health fair costs.
   c. The guidance/considerations for health fairs should be reported in the Results section.

6. Conclusion: The authors conclude that health fairs can be effective in increasing screening rates when implemented with the core components that are presented in this paper, however, they do not present evidence in support of this conclusion. In fact, it's not entirely clear which components are core—are they the list of health fair elements in Table 4?

7. Tables
   a. Table 1
      i. What are "Community Guide Strategies"? It would be helpful to organize the activities according to the specified strategies.
      ii. Does the estimated number of participants refer to people who enrolled in the study or people who attended the fair?
      iii. Does the number of onsite screening/referrals refer to all attendees or just study participants?
      iv. Why is the number of volunteer hours specified for one site only?

   b. Table 2
      i. Please report the total number of participants whose responses are included.
      ii. Are all participants with baseline data included, or just those who completed both a baseline and follow-up survey?

   c. Table 3: Please indicate that behavior data are reported as n and %.
   d. Table 4: Please describe in the text how you arrived at these considerations. In particular, the need for a theoretical framework is not mentioned anywhere in the text.
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