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Reviewer's report:

A paper to present the results of a systematic, selective, internet-based Chlamydia screening programme started in April 2008 in the Netherlands.

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   • In general yes, however, there is an unclear differentiation between introduction, methods, results and discussion sections with repetition between sections, would advise the authors to refer to the guidelines for publication on the biomed central website.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   • Whilst an interesting paper to compare protocols in different countries, I found it difficult to review in places as the wording was incorrect. I would recommend the paper be re-edited by someone with a better knowledge of the English language before it can be accepted for publication in an English scientific journal.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   • Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   • Can you please include your screening questionnaire as an appendix
   • Who followed up, did contact tracing and initiated treatment of the positive cases?
   • How are partners of cases notified? Is it done in a confidential manner?

3. Are the data sound?
   • Other published papers have demonstrated that young people want the ‘sex’ taken out of Chlamydia screening and for it to be offered to all young people in order for it to be acceptable to them and that if they are asked about their sexual activity they are likely to lie and this may affect your results. If a young person wanted to be screened surely there was nothing to stop them lying to be able to be included within the programme?


4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   • Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   • Little has been considered of young peoples opinions of screening programmes – whilst the authors state acceptability to this method will be discussed in a different paper, there should be reference to the methods they are using and already published papers comparing screening methods.
   • Within the discussion section the authors state that young people will be invited to be screened annually as compared to other countries who are attempting to screen at partner change – do you think this method is acceptable to affect positivity and control the spread of Chlamydia infection?
   • Levels of contact tracing via this method seem to be very low with less than 1 person being treated per positive case – this is obviously not high enough to affect spread, surely if this is to be an effective method of screening this level of contact tracing will need to be increased significantly and discussion around this included within the paper.
   • Modelling has shown that in order to be an affective screening programme 40-50% of the eligible population needs to be screened – in light of your low uptake I would like to discussion about how you plan to change this programme to reach higher levels of screening?

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   • It would be interesting to know if ALL people within the age group are registered at local communes – what about university students, homeless people and other transient populations?

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   • Within your conclusion you state that PID is just one end-point for the effectiveness of Chlamydia screening to be measured against. What other endpoints do you think would be suitable?

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS
None
**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.
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