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Dear Editor,

I would like to thank you for reviewing the paper entitled *Urine-based testing for Chlamydia trachomatis among young adults in a population-based survey in Croatia: Feasibility and prevalence.*

We corrected the paper based on your further comments, and in the table below you can please find the answers to your questions and suggestions. We hope that now the paper is adequate for publishing. Let us know please if there is a need for further clarifications.

With best wishes,

Dr Ivana Bozicevic, MSc, DrPH
On behalf of the co-authors
### Point-by-point response to the concerns of the reviewers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments of the editor</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I noticed that age of respondents was not included in table 1, possibly because of small age range of the study population. Still, as shown by other studies, age can be an important determinant. Please provide information on age as a determinant for providing urine.</td>
<td>We included now age in Table 1 (stratified as 18-21 and 22-25). In univariate analysis the older age group (22-25) had a significantly higher odds of providing urine (p=0.04), but this was not statistically significant in the multivariate analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results section: there are several repetitions in text and table. Please omit from the text of the results section all numbers and proportions/prevalences that are already mentioned in the table, e.g. all proportions of providing urine or prevalence of C Trachomatis according to different determinants.  

Done

The results section p 9: since there are no statistically significant results that need further mentioning and since all numbers are already shown in the table 2, please shorten the text on prevalence of C Trachomatis in the following way:  
Please omit from the result section that describes the prevalence (p 9), all text that follows after the first sentence. Authors can add a statement that several determinants (table 2) were investigated but not found to be statistically significantly associated.  

Done

Textual advise: there are still several typos in the text (some are mentioned below but please check the paper carefully again)  
* abstract: 'assessed' misspelled  
* page 9, omit 'but that was not significant at the p=0.05% level'  

Done

* p 10 discussion section: 'survey on sexual behaviour including willingness to test for C Trachomatis'  

Done. It is written now as: This is the first general population-based survey on sexual behaviour in young adults in Croatia that...
* p 10 'counties' in stead of countries

* p 10 'The main limitation in interpretation of determinants for C trachomatis seropositivity is a low response rate...etc.'

* Authors may want to rethink the need for stating the very last sentence in the discussion section (before conclusions) since effectiveness on screening policy of providing money for C Trachomatis testing may be different between a country that already has a strong testpolicy and that has historically placed screening as a priority on the policy agenda and a country in which first awareness needs to be raised for the problem and need for screening in itselve (such as in Croatia).

* p 11 consider omitting 'due to lack of funding...' since this seems not applicable to mention for the purpose of this study.

* p 11 'achieved' misspelled

* p 12 'Although findings were not statistically significant, in our study behaviours in young adults in Croatia that included willingness to test for C trachomatis.'

Done
Done
Done

We meant that incentives should be provided for C trachomatis testing in surveys, not in screening programmes. This sentence is now hopefully more clear: Small financial incentives for providing specimens in bio-behavioural surveys, in this case urine, might also increase participation rate [25].

Done
Done
Done
prevalence of C trachomatis was higher among those socially vulnerable...etc.'