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Reviewer's report:

Overall this is a helpful study, with a solid rationale and methods appropriate to answer the research questions posed.

A number of sentences require re-writing for parsability and excessive length e.g.

- Method pg of abstract
- results 1st sentence, results pg2 last sentence, results pg3 last 2 sentences

Multiple places: population based --> population-based

...nor did we [make] explicit a time frame...

Volk et al is mentioned, however it should be called-out that it covers the effectiveness of CRC screening DAs, not just DAs in general, and also provide rationale as to why none of the reviewed tools are appropriate (population? language?)

Method p1 - ’...reminders to undergo the screening [in the past].’

Decision aid design - this is described, but not rationalized - perhaps ground in the Volk et al results?

Why was one patient not analyzed in each group for intention to undergo screening?

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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