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Reviewer's report:

-Major Compulsory Revisions: The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example, additional necessary experiments or controls, statistical mistakes, errors in interpretation.

1. (Table) The table displays ‘Participant and practice demographics’, which is descriptive of the sample population of healthcare providers selected for the study, but very little is mentioned in the discussion as to how this relates to the primary outcome measures of the study. The authors go into detail (Methods, second paragraph) regarding the “deprivation score” of the practice sites of the interviewed providers; however, there it is no clear correlation between deprivation score and the providers’ view on internet-based Chlamydia screening among young men. How are the responses from the providers in clinics with a deprivation score of 1 different than those from clinics with a deprivation score of 5? Perhaps this correlation can be better outlined in the discussion section.

2. The author states (Data analysis) that a major limitation to the study is that all PN’s interviewed were female; yet states that overall, there were few differences in views between GPs (50:50 male to female ratio) and PNs. This is confusing, as there is no clear relationship to gender and views of internet screening outlined in the article. How does provider gender influence primary outcomes?

-Minor Essential Revisions: The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

1. (Barriers and facilitators, Design and recruitment facilitators) The author has the subtitle “Design and recruitment facilitators” yet in the fourth paragraph potential scrutiny relating to infidelity by male partners is discussed; this seems more like a barrier than a facilitator to screening young men. Further, the practical issues for internet screening are discussed in the third paragraph - is this a facilitator or barrier?

- Discretionary Revisions: These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.
1. Since this study is focused on Chlamydia screening in a target population: young men; perhaps this should be reflected in the title of the article.
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