



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63404

Title: Facilitators and barriers to colorectal cancer screening in an outpatient setting

Reviewer's code: 03005388

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-02-25 01:44

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-11 01:44

Review time: 14 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Although this is a local research, I agree this issue is very important to promote people for colorectal cancer screening in most countries, especially in a rural community. My comments are below

1. The authors said "...in this retrospective cross-sectional study" in results, also said "The overarching goal of this retrospective and prospective study is to..." in conclusions. I confused what is the study design in this manuscript?
2. What is the definition of travel distance to clinic (recorded as zip code), and what is the meanings and units of "Travel distance from clinic" in Table2.
3. What's the definition of no-show rate (percent), and how to calculate?
4. What's the full name of EMR ?
5. In conclusions, the authors said "Telephone surveys will identify patient-level barriers such as embarrassment, fear of bowel prep, and lack of education on various modalities", however, the authors didn't describe the methodology in Materials and Methods. The authors just presented "... retrospective review of electronic medical records was conducted for patients ages 50 to 75 years who were seen in the East Carolina University Internal Medicine clinic between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019.", rather than "Telephone surveys".
6. The authors should present the difference between up-to-date with CRC screening "YES" with "No" and show the p-value in each variable in Table 1.
7. The authors should show the units of Age, Patients Up-To-Dates on CRC screening and No-Show Rate in Table1.
8. The authors need to show the ORs and 95% CI of univariate and multivariate logistic regression analysis results in Table2.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63404

Title: Facilitators and barriers to colorectal cancer screening in an outpatient setting

Reviewer's code: 03005388

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-23

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-08 02:59

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-10 01:03

Review time: 1 Day and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

All the comments were addressed in this revised manuscript, although I didn't see a



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

respond letter according to the point by point from my comments.