Reviewer’s report

Title: Is there an added value of faecal calprotectin and haemoglobin in the diagnostic work-up for primary care patients suspected of significant colorectal disease? A cross-sectional diagnostic study

Version: 0 Date: 08 Jul 2016

Reviewer: Grazia Grazzini

Reviewer's report:

The Authors evaluated new diagnostic strategies in patients with persistent suspected symptoms within a primary care setting in order to avoid unnecessary endoscopic examinations.

The paper is a high quality level one and worth certainly to be published.

I have only minor remarks:

* The Authors defined advanced adenoma as adenoma larger than 10 mm. Usually the definition of these lesions includes also histological parameters. The Authors should explain why they used this definition.

* The Authors have used the diagnostic accuracy of point-of-care (POC) calprotectin and faecal immunochemical haemoglobin tests, giving for more information the reference n. 14. They should explain better this new concept.

* The type of FIT used in the study is a qualitative one, but no information were available about cut off of sensitivity.

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:
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