

To the Reviewers,

We thank you for taking the time to read our manuscript and offer suggestions for improvement. Below is a list of the stated concerns with an explanation of how they were addressed in the manuscript.

Reviewer 1:

I have read with great interest the article entitled Colorectal Cancer Screening in the COVID-19 Era. The authors provide a nice narrative review in a subject of the utmost importance in this moment. Authors have included information from several subjects related to the impact of COVID 19 pandemic and the possible solutions. However, I miss several points in this review.

1. The measures taken in the endoscopy units to limit the transmission of SARS-COV2 (Marin-Gabriel JC, et al.) with special reference to the limitation of capacity of procedures due to the implementation of these protective measures to reduce the risk of SARS-COV2 transmission

Additions were made to discuss the additional measures being taken in endoscopy units and their effect on operating capacity

2. The authors do not add any discussion to SARS-COV2 infection as an additional risk for healthy subjects in CRC screening. I include a reference to an article recently published.

Additions were made to discuss the findings of this study.

3. Authors should include some information regarding the detection of CRC in symptomatic patients and the role of FIT in these patients (D' Souza et al)

Additions were made to discuss the role of FIT in screening of symptomatic patients with reference to this article.

4. Authors should include information regarding delay in diagnosis after a positive FIT from the Italian group (Zorzi et al.)

Additions were made to discuss the increased risk and progression of CRC with a delay after a positive FIT.

5. With respect to open access colonoscopy, please cite the article PMID 24641457

Additions were made discussing the decreased time delay and higher diagnostic yield with open access colonoscopy.

Reviewer 2:

Thank you for this important review.

1. The version submitted was a draft, with comments from the senior author embedded in the word document. It is unclear if changes need to be made based on those comments, but certainly a re-submitted version would need those comments removed.

The comments were removed.

2. Additionally, some of the language seems repetitive and can be minimized.

The article was revised and some repetitive sentences were removed as appropriate.

This is a review paper which addresses different components to screening, barriers and potential options for screening. It highlights important issues and makes recommendations. There are no unique findings, but the authors do make some strong suggestions based on available evidence. Style is organized and easy to follow.

3. The figures do not seem appropriate -for example figure 2 is a flow chart- while it is not describing flow or a process, therefore another type of image or table may be more appropriate and understandable for the reader to interpret.

Figure 2 was deleted and replaced with Table 3, which discusses advantages and disadvantages of open access colonoscopy.

We again thank the reviewers for their time and for the suggestions that they offered. Please let us know if we have adequately addressed all concerns.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Anusri Kadakuntla', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Anusri Kadakuntla