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.

All of the reviewers' questions/suggestions have been addressed in this revised manuscript. Comments which were addressed in the revised manuscript:

1. This is a retrospective study. Originally this study was going to have a prospective component which was later decided against due to large study population and feasibility issues.

2. Travel distance to clinic involved using Google maps to measure the distance in miles from the patient's home zip code to the address of our clinic. The unit of distance is miles, which has been updated in the table.

3. No show rate percent is automatically populated in the Epic EMR, however it is calculated as a percentage of missed visits into the total number of scheduled/not canceled visits.

4. EMR = Epic electronic medical record

5. Similar to comment #1-- Initially this study was going to include a second part with telephone surveys to those patients who were not up-to-date on screening, to establish patient reported factors which were holding them back from being screened for CRC. We decided not to pursue this part of the study at this time due to large study population and feasibility issues. This has since been removed from the manuscript.

6. This has been updated in the table.

7. This has been updated in the table.

8. This has been updated in the table.