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Reviewer's report:

No gender differences in Chlamydia infection prevalence in the general population: a systematic review

Thank you for letting me review this article. The article is well written and provides a useful overview of CT prevalence in men and women. However, I have some concerns that I will address below.

Major compulsory revisions

1. The rationale for the study is not entirely clear. Do the authors have an assumption that men are not targeted for chlamydia testing because they are believed to have a lower CT prevalence than women? As the review shows, most published population based prevalence surveys show an almost similar CT prevalence in men and women. The authors need to clarify and document if there is a link between presumed lower CT prevalence among men and gender differences in screening strategies.

2. The major problem with the article is that neither the implications nor the conclusion is supported by the findings in this systematic review.

Although mentioned in the background that there is absence of evidence for the benefits of opportunistic screening, the authors conclude that opportunistic screening for CT in general practice for both men and women is recommended. This review does not answer the question on whether opportunistic screening should be recommended for either women or men. There is still lack of evidence to prove that opportunistic screening in general practice will reduce the community prevalence and finally reduce the long term complications of CT. The conclusion and the implications must therefore be rewritten to actually answer the study question - is there a gender difference in CT prevalence.

The article needs a more in-depth discussion of their findings, strengths and weaknesses of the different prevalence studies included. Instead, the authors use much space to discuss STI counselling in general practice and barriers to screening - this is outside the scope of this particular study.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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