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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

The 6 month trial period was compared to a 12 month pre-trial period. Why to use two periods with different duration? Is it possible to analyse the date using two six month periods in the same part of the year? Are the results similar to the results in the submitted article?

The discussion describes that one particular GP influenced the global results of the intervention group in a relevant way: he or she counted for 44% of all chlamydia tests in the pre-trial period and 23% in the trial period. It seems reasonable that GP-characteristics, or personal (changing?) attitudes will influence the outcome. Can you analyse the data on the level of each participating GP? For example with a new outcome parameter: the difference between the number of chlamydia tests in the pre-trial period and the trial period.

Is there a figure available of the number of tests during the whole study period, on the level of each GP? What does it shows?

A positive test result can stimulate GP's to continue, or enhance screening for new chlamydia cases. Is this effect measured in this study? Was their a difference in positive chlamydia tests between the two groups? Was their a difference in positive chlamydia tests between the participating GP's? In the pre-trial period? In the trial period?

**Minor Essential Revisions**

The screening intensity is described in the percentage of chlamydia tests in the women of the target group. Is it possible to give the absolute numbers as well?

**Discretionary Revisions**

Does I understand it correct that every practice in the control group and the intervention group received $1000 AUD; and that in addition each GP in the intervention group yielded 5 $ AUD for each chlamydia test performed in the target group. Do you know how the yielded money was divided in the different practices? A personal yield for each GP? Equally divided among all GP's of the practice? Another system of distribution of the money?
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