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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for this interesting article. Some comments below to help improve the article.

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

1) Discussion is good but could be better by setting the context of this research with other screening research e.g. how do your results of the screening rate of 49% compare with other countries? Has other studies been done of colorectal screening in HIV-positive populations? if not, compare with other general populations.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

1) Abstract - please add 95% CI for percentages quoted in line 49
2) Abstract - please clarify what you mean by follow up (line 49) - reading the rest of the paper seems to suggest this is for 5 years?
3) Abstract - line 57 - you use the word "under-utilized" but what is this compared to? Most good screening programs have screening rates between 50-70% but I wouldn't think they would classify themselves as 'under-utilized'. Perhaps changing this word might better reflect the findings of the study or rephrasing the sentence to say that less than half of the population were undergoing colorectal screening.
4) Typo - line 146 - 'nal cancer' -> anal cancer?
5) line 215/216 - please add 95% confidence intervals for your proportions

Discretionary revisions

1) line 155 - define the length of time of follow up - ?5 years?
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