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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to read this manuscript. I found it to be an interesting review of CRC in younger patients and it goes some way to supporting the argument the age for screening should be reduced in many countries.

However, you need to change the staging through the manuscript.

In his 1948 paper Cuthbert Dukes never described a stage D this was added later, what iteration of the Dukes staging system did you use?. Irrespective of that the Dukes system is no longer used, I am surprised you stuck to it for this manuscript. The TNM should be used and even if you can not accurately T and N and M each tumour you should be able to put the patients into the appropriate Stage 1-4 category not Dukes A-D.

Lines 47-50 page 5 of the proof

Five year survival rates in those aged less than 40 years was found to be worse (57%) compared to those aged between 40 and 54 years (68% and 62%).

what does the 68% and 62% refer to? the way the sentence reads there should be only one % associated with 'between 40 and 54 years'

It is only when you look at table 2 it makes sense

68% refers to those between 40 and 49 years and 62% for those between 50 and 54 years

This needs to be made clearer in the text or you should put 68-62% not 68% and 62%.
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