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Reviewer’s report:

Many thanks for giving me the opportunity to review this very important study. My initial thought was that, although the study has produced a very rich dataset, only a small amount of information is presented within the paper. I notice that the authors have a further paper in press at BMC which I couldn't access - perhaps that paper provides additional information. Here are a few additional points which the authors should address within the paper:

1 I suggest that the authors provide more data in the results section particularly around determinants of incidence and detected rates of positivity.

2 The authors mention the term prevalence, it would be good if they could define how they would calculate prevalence from the collected data both in terms of the overall population and within specific geographic areas.

3 A 'risk score' was used in one area - the authors should provide the criteria used and also the evidence base used to inform the development of this score.

4 The evaluation strategy should be outlined in more detail in terms of what measures are being used, why they were selected and how accurate they will be in detecting changes in the burden of chlamydial related diseases.

5 Detected positivity appears to be quite low. Have the authors assessed whether these levels of positivity are sufficient to bring about a reduction in disease prevalence within the medium term, say 5 years?

6 If positivity is too low, how will the authors increase the level of screening to the required level and sustain it at that level?

7 The authors should compare their experience to that in other countries, such as the English National Chlamydia Screening Programme, which has also addressed these key issues.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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