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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written straightforward survey. It would benefit from more detail and more clarity around the presentation of the results.

The question posed by the authors is well defined in the introduction but in the discussion the authors need to say what it means. How did these results help the authors increase chlamydia screening to levels where it may decrease the prevalence....the discussion (preferably the first paragraph) should contain this very clear point.

The methods a little unclear - I suggest more detail is needed rather than just asking readers to find another paper.. For example which survey is this study referring to- the initial one or the one where people were called back? How was the sub sample chosen for the second study?

What is an ‘education’ centre? What type of workplace was chosen and why?

When exactly was the study undertaken (dates of the 4 weeks).

How did they know the age of the individuals they approached?

The results are unclear. OR are presented but it is not clear what they refer to.....what is the referent group?

In table one.....I’m not sure I totally agree with the answers to all the questions as being correct or not.

In table 2- what is the OR refer to? Is not clear enough...needs to be spelt out really clearly.

Discussion

The first paragraph should come out and say- what does all this mean- how have we progressed, but it doesn’t really do this.

I’m also lost to know if the authors think this is a good way of recruiting people, whether knowledge is important and how it would effect recruitment is these venues.

The limitations of the work are clearly stated- i.e. their knowledge may have been positively influenced by reading the materials.
Abstract

Include data in the abstract with key N’s and confidence intervals.
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