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The Editor
BMC Public Health

To the Editor,

RE: Outreach for chlamydia and gonorrhoea screening: a systematic review of strategies and outcomes

Thank you for reviewing the above named manuscript and the feedback you provided on the 11th September 2013.

We are pleased to provide you with a revised manuscript. We have outlined how we have addressed your concerns in the text below.

- Please check the instructions for authors on the journal website to ensure that your manuscript follows the correct structure for this journal and article type.

  The manuscript has been edited to ensure it follows the correct structure for this journal and article type.

- Please adhere to PRISMA guidelines when reporting Systematic Reviews (http://www.prisma-statement.org/).

  We have referred to the PRISMA checklist and have adhered to these guidelines as is mentioned in the first sentence of the methods, and as demonstrated in Figure 1. Search Strategy.

- We advise you to seek the assistance of a fluent English speaking colleague, or to have a professional editing service correct your language.

  The first author is a fluent English speaker, as are all the co-authors. All authors have re-read the manuscript and corrected the language where needed.

Reviewer concerns have also been addressed as described below.

Referee 1:

- A cost-effectiveness analysis is underdeveloped, although this would be an essential piece of information.
No cost-effectiveness analyses were included in the papers as such analyses rely on data from randomised controlled studies or studies with comparisons groups, which were not included in our review. We have noted in the discussion however the importance of cost studies, see page 11 line 24 to page 12, line 2.

- Table 2a and 2b, though being already very crowded, could show columns for treatment rates for CT and NG, even just to show the data are not available in most cases.

We have simplified the tables 2a and 2b by deleting the column ‘target gender’ as this information is specified in the ‘target group’ column, and combined ‘participation number’ with ‘participation rates’ and included a new column on ‘treatment rates’.

Referee 2:

- Page 3: Abstract, para 3: Results: Suggest to split 64% into 2, ie Australia and the United States to give an idea to the reader on the origin of the program

We have split the 64% as suggested by the reviewer (see line 1 of the results section in the abstract).

- Chlamydia as a genus or Chlamydia trachomatis should be in italics throughout the article

*Chlamydia trachomatis* is now in italics throughout the manuscript.

- Page 4 line 4 Neisseria gonorrhoea should read Neisseria gonorrhoeae and should be in italics

These changes have been made

We look forward to hearing from you shortly.

Yours sincerely

Belinda Hengel