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Reviewer's report:
The authors have been very responsive to the review. I have just a few relatively minor comments.

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).
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.
3. The sentence specifying that the authors attempted to conduct the process evaluation on half of the baseline participants is included twice (page 6).
4. How were participants selected to do the follow-up survey? Were they randomly selected from each site?
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.
6. The manuscript should be reviewed for typographical and grammatical errors.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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