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Reviewer's report:

Title and abstract:

1. The title of the article: “A simple way to compare the efficiency of outreach Chlamydia screening activities” does not represent the total content of the article. In the methods and results section of the article the data from the second phase of the SOC program is presented and the efficiency of the outreach screening activity measured (with 3 new concepts). Besides this, a real comparison of different outreach screening activities, to support the statement in the title, is missing. Minor Essential Revisions

2. In the abstract (background) no aim is described. Furthermore, the methods in the abstract contain different information compared to the methods section in the article. In the methods of the abstract concepts to measure efficiency are described, while in the methods section of the article only the SOC program is explained. At last, in the conclusion of the abstract a real conclusion is missing. A suggestion for a conclusion are the following sentences in the discussion section: “Although the original study demonstrated……….. settings beyond the ACT”. Major Compulsory Revisions

Background:

3. In the background section you write about the need to target young people. Why is this important? And who are these young people (age and characteristics; high risk sexual behavior, bisexual etc.)? Discretionary Revisions

4. In the background section you write about the need to target especially males who are difficult to engage in the formal health care system. Why are they difficult to engage in the formal health care system? Discretionary Revisions

5. In the background section a clearly stated aim is missing. What is the aim of the article? Is the aim to introduction 3 new concepts to measure or/and compare the efficiency of outreach Chlamydia screening activities? Is the aim to present data from the second phase of the SOC program? Is the aim to evaluate the use of 3 new concepts to measure and compare the efficiency of outreach screening activities? Major Compulsory Revisions
6. In the background section you mention the introduction of 3 new concepts, but no explanation is provided why they should be introduced.
What is the reason for introduction and what is the added value of these new concepts when comparing with the current concepts (proportion of positive tests and screening yield)? Major Compulsory Revisions

7. The following sentences in the background section should be written in the conclusion section: “In combination with the more familiar measures…….. Chlamydia testing in target populations”. In these sentences you conclude that the 3 new concepts are good estimates to measure and compare the efficiency of outreach screening activities and can be used to find the most efficient way to increase Chlamydia testing in target populations. Minor Essential Revisions

Methods:

8. In the methods section a different target group is mentioned compared to the results section and abstract.
- In the abstract: “people aged 18 and 39 years were offered a cash incentive”
- In the methods: “which targeted males and females between the ages of 16 and 30 years?”
- In the results: "in the 16 to 30 years age range and the other 2 in males aged 41 and 50 respectively.

What is the target group in this article and who were offered a cash incentive in the second phase of the SOC program? Minor Essential Revisions

9. In the methods section you write: “Individuals were considered to have been exposed to the screening opportunity if they approached one of the staff members and or took written materials”.
How did you deal with double counting? People who approached different staff members and/or took written materials more than ones? Discretionary Revisions

10. The following sentence in the methods section is too detailed and can be deleted: “Urine samples were returned…… more than 24 hours was anticipated”. Discretionary Revisions

11. The following sentence in the methods section is detailed background information about the SOC program and should be written in the background section: “The SOC program is conducted by Canberra Sexual…….. the ACT Department of Health”. Minor Essential Revisions

Results:

12. Looking at the title of the article I expected a more detailed description of the individual result of each of the 18 outreach activities (table 1). Furthermore, figure
should be described here, before mention it in the discussion section. Minor Essential Revisions

Discussion:

13. The following sentences in the discussion section: “The ‘event screening tempo’…….. of a particular program or activity” should be mentioned in the background section. In these sentences some background information about the 3 new concepts and the added value of these concepts are described. Minor Essential Revisions

14. In the discussion section a lot of new information/results are provided. This information should be first mentioned and described in the background and/or results section, before describing it in the discussion. It concerns specific information about the event screening tempo, staff hour screening tempo and the proportion of positive Chlamydia tests from the SOC program. Minor Essential Revisions

15. To have a more structured discussion section you could include two sub-headings: study limitations and future implications for screening and/or research. Discretionary Revisions

16. The following sentences in the discussion: “Although the original SOC study demonstrated……..community settings beyond the ACT” should be mentioned in the conclusion section. In the conclusion section a real conclusion is missing and this section is to short. Major Compulsory Revisions
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