

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 47171

Manuscript Type: OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

**Colorectal Cancer fecal screening test completion after age 74, sources and outcomes
in French**

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you for your critics for improving the quality of the manuscript.

All comments, criticisms and suggestions have been amply ripened by all authors.

Please find below the answers to various questions and ambiguities.

We wish you good reception.

The Authors

Comments

Reviewer #1:

The article "Colorectal Cancer fecal screening test completion after age 74, sources and outcomes in French program", by Akoi Koivogui et al, is an observational study documenting the results of a screening test in a subgroup of individuals aged 75 or more. It shows a high rate of colonoscopy after a positive test and a high proportion of screened lesions, suggesting that the exclusion of elderly people after age 75 may be arbitrary. As recognized by the authors, the study has a series of limitations, but I

think it is useful to promote a debate on the subject, and possibly further studies trying to answer the question about the age limit for screening programs. I suggest acceptance for publication.

Answer-1:

We are currently looking for a partner to well address the subject in France.

Reviewer #2:

In the current study, the authors describe CRC fecal screening test completion after age 74, source (CRC SP/Provider ordered) and outcomes of these tests. They concerned 18,704 Elderly_75 residing in eleven French districts, having performed a CRC screening test between January 2008 and December 2017. Overall, the study is interesting and meaningful, thus, several flaws should be addressed.

1. Check the whole manuscript carefully and avoid grammar and spelling errors. 2.

The authors should provide a relatively detailed description for CRCSP. 3. What about the rate of lost to follow-up and the compliance rate? 4. Provide the exact P values not just $P < 0.001$.

Question/Remarks-1

Check the whole manuscript carefully and avoid grammar and spelling errors.

Answer-1:

We thank you for the comment you made on the relevance of the subject covered in this manuscript. We have read carefully the text. Some grammatical corrections were also made. However, for text quality, we also remain attentive to any proposals in this direction.

Question/Remarks-2

The authors should provide a relatively detailed description for CRCSP.

Answer-2:

We clarified the message and improved the presentation of CRCSP in methodology, section : Distribution of screening tests in the districts, paragraph 2.

Question/Remarks-3

What about the rate of lost to follow-up and the compliance rate?.

Answer-3:

In order to perform the screening test, we can not talk about lost to follow-up in this study because no follow-up sample was previously defined. People performed the test sporadically.

For those lost to follow-up after a positive test, we could not initiate a follow-up procedure because the program does not authorize it. Only their GPs could organize a follow-up.

Question/Remarks-4

Provide the exact P values not just $P < 0.001$

Answer-4:

We provided the exact P values in the text. We had given up because of the number of zero.