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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
One of the prime conclusions of this work: "If an effort is not put into reducing young women's identity concerns the population coverage of chlamydia screening might be reduced..."

I don't see this conclusion as arising from the data presented and indeed even if it did it is arguable how useful a conclusion this is. In a practical sense what work can be done overall to reduce young women's identity concerns? A more useful and direct conclusion might be that chlamydia testing, screening, treatment and partner notification need to be normalised and destigmatised to allow significant population coverage of chlamydia screening. This finding is consistent with previous work in the area.

See quote from respondent page 7 "...It would be important to say that everyone's being tested..."

Minor essential revisions:

While it is laudable to be clear about the process for recruitment and study design the recruitment description is overly detailed. It is a flaw in this study (as acknowledged in the Limitations) that they were unable to include the views of young men and as the recruitment section delineates this appears to have been a decision influenced by recruitment problems rather than conscious study design. This would be better if clearly and simply acknowledged rather than the reader being left to draw this inference from the Recruitment description.

As is mentioned in the Limitations it might have been a limiting factor to use a male interviewer to interview young women - why was interviewer chosen? I would like this delineated in the methods.

In the section entitled Notification preferences I would be interested in knowing whether the responses as coded are entirely respondent generated or whether they are responding to prompts as to methods of receiving results. In similar work I have done in Australia the young women expressed a strong preference for notification face to face by the testing professional (ideally doctor) with a secondary preference for a phone call to their mobile.

Is there a better quote that could be chosen to show the young women's concern for the health professional's identity? This is an interesting finding but the quote
chosen does not demonstrate it clearly enough.

There are a number of minor spelling errors that need to be found before publication e.g. yung for young, also in some parts of the paper the English expression changes to a more colloquial style which detracts from the overall impression. A thorough proofreading is recommended.

Discretionary revisions
I have the impression that the authors have used a spell check using Microsoft Word, which is set to USA English, and as a result all references to chlamydia have been capitalised and words ending in ise have been changed to ize. Unless the current forms are the norm in Ireland I would respectfully suggest that the manuscript be written in UK English and chlamydia be written in lower case unless it is referring to the organism itself: "Chlamydia trachomatis".

**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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