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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting paper regarding the views of young women on implementing chlamydia screening in general practice in Australia. The findings are relevant both for practitioners and researchers in the field. As a scientific paper using qualitative methods it has serious weaknesses, however.

The question is well defined, but quite broad with three parts:
1. to determine how Australian young women feel about being asked to test for chlamydia when they attend a GP for any reason
2. the potential psychosocial impacts of chlamydial screening
3. to determine what information and support young women would find helpful

The choice of methods is appropriate (in depth, face-to-face semistructured interviews).

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. The authors should share their preconceptions, that is their previous experiences and prestudy beliefs, motivation and qualifications for exploration of the views of young women on chlamydia screening.

2. The methods are not well described. The authors should consider the following issues;
2a. How were the questions chosen and the interview guide for the semi-structured interviews developed?
2b. What was the main content of the interview guide for the semi-structured interviews?
2c. I understand from "Authors’ contribution" that NP conducted the interviews. RP supervised the conduct of the interviews. I think this should be stated in the methods section.

3. The description of how the analysis was done should be made more explicit. The authors should state the theoretical frame of reference ("reading glasses" used in analyses). What are the theories, models or notions that the authors applied for interpretation of the material?

4. The authors should make the strengths and limitations of the study explicit.
5. I miss evidence of authors’ reflexivity in the manuscript: have the authors attended systematically to the effect of the researcher, at every step of the research process? If so - how?

Minor essential revisions:
5. In the discussion it is stated that the women interviewed were primarily recruited by female GPs, and that they preferred female to male doctors. Both statements belong to the results section. The second could be omitted from the paper. I agree with the authors it seems less significant.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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