

Dear editor,

We are pleased to resubmit the revised version of the manuscript COLORECTAL CANCER POPULATION SCREENING PROGRAMS WORLDWIDE IN 2016: AN UPDATE. We thank the Editor and Reviewers for their comments and suggestions which have improved the manuscript.

Below please see the point-by-point reply to comments raised by the reviewers and to answer point by point reviewer comments:

- **Editor's comments:**

1) q1

Reply: We have adapted the institution information to the rules of WJG.

2) q2: *This file must be signed by the corresponding author and provided in a PDF format, and the statement must also be mentioned as a footnote in the manuscript text.*

Reply: We added the conflict of interest statement as a footnote in the first page and attach it in PDF format signed by the corresponding author.

- **Reviewer 57299:**

o Minor comments:

1) *In abstracts, similar phrase (e.g., Women were more apt to participate in screening programs, but men showed higher rates of positive test results) was repeated, and need to be concise.*

Reply: We have modified the abstract and deleted the redundant phrase.

2) *On Page 15, Updated article regarding participation rates for CRC screening in South Korea has recently been published (Suh M, et al. Cancer Res Treat 2016 Nov 11 [Epub ahead of print]).*

Reply: We included the new data about participation rate in the South Korean screening program.

- **Reviewer 33045:**

- Major comments:

- 1) *Given that this is a review article, there should be no section labeled as "Methods"*

Reply: The section labeled as Methods was deleted from the manuscript. The information concerning how the literature search was performed has been included in the background section. We believe this is important information.