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Reviewer's report:

This is a unique survey on follow up to self testing results. It does add to the sparse evidence on the topic.

I have minor suggestions, rather clarifications.

Abstract:

Please report whether the sample was a random sample or not; what was the time frame for completing the survey and what was the targeted age group? Please incorporate details in the methods section of the manuscript. Proportions should also be mentioned alongside percentages in the results.

Full text:

1. Methods:
   A. Design: For those of us who are not aware of this terminology, please explain "an existing open access internet panel." also mention your study population, target population for generalizibility, time frame for conducting the survey, regular or non regular users of internet?
   B. The study question should be clearly stated with its primary and secondary aims.

2. Results:
   A. please divide your results into follow up for normal results, follow up for abnormal results and follow up for inconclusive results. You have presented them as tables, but it will be easy to read if presented using the suggested headings.
   B. for those of us not familiar with the Dutch educational system, how are low, intermediate and high education levels quantified/defined?
   C. What is meant by re-assured by study results? Please define each end point--measured and computed by your survey data.
   D. Please report follow up of study results in numbers and proportions.
   E. Validity section: To whom are the results generalizable to?
   F. Discussion: This section requires some work. What are the implications of the study for practice? ( for future self testers?) what are the implications for research? Where should the self testing research be headed? What is the take home message for false positive and false reactive or inconclusive test results? Should self tests be approved for infectious and chronic diseases? How does
accuracy of the results play a role in uptake of results? How does interpreting test results play a role for increasing uptake of self testing notion. For example, in point of care HIV tests, sometimes we get weakly reactive test lines, that are mis-interpreted as falsely positive/negative leading to anxiety on the part of the test taker. Could you discuss these issues.

G. Conclusion: The conclusion section should be beefed up in the light of the above arguments.

thanks!
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