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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revisions

OVERALL CLARITY OF THE PAPER

1. The concept of the term 'screening experience' is not clear at the outset of the paper. It would be helpful to describe this at the beginning, and why this links in to the design of the internet screening.

2. The paper purports to aim to inform the design of an Internet-based approach to screening. However, it is not very apparent what the internet-approach might be. There is an implicit suggestion that a letter will get sent to a young male, but it is unclear what the process will be after this. If they screen positive, what happens next? The paper seems to suggest that there will not be any intervention from GPs. I am therefore unclear why the authors seek the views of GPs and PNs on the strategy.

METHODS

3. What was the rationale for selecting 2 central regions (Edinburgh and Glasgow)? This is not clear to the reader.

4. It is not clear from the methods whether only one health professional was interviewed at each practice, or whether several could be interviewed at one practice.

5. The methods suggest that practices were purposefully selected for high and low deprivation, and for low and high proportion of males 16-24 registered. What did the authors consider to be 'low' deprivation or 'high deprivation'? And what proportion of registered males were considered to be high/low? (See later comment re results)

6. Who undertook the interviews? Was is just one researcher, or a team?

DATA ANALYSIS

7. How were the data analysed? Was each interview analysed independently using the coding framework by each researcher, then results compared? Or did members of the team analyse a proportion of the interviews?
RESULTS

8. If interviewees were purposefully selected from the practices as stated in the methods, it is unclear why the practices are from a range of areas of deprivation (not just low/high), and why the proportion of registered 16-24 yr males is similar between practices. This should be clarified in the discussion section.

9. It is unclear how the experience of GPs and PNs in a practice setting is relevant to an internet approach. Much of the results section reported on why GPs/PNs think they may screen more women, or feel more comfortable raising sexual health as a topic, but this is not related to the discussion or conclusion.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

'I declare that I have no competing interests'