Reviewer's report

Title: Chlamydia trachomatis Infection among Female Inmates at Briman Prison in Saudi Arabia

Version: 2 Date: 28 January 2014

Reviewer: Preeti Pathela

Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1. What were the dates of the study (time frame)?

2. Was a systematic sample of consecutively incarcerated women included in the study?

3. What is the average number incarcerated per year? This is important to know in order to target screening if necessary.

4. 64 women were not tested. What biases could this have introduced? How did the 64 differ from the others such that true prevalence could have been overestimated or underestimated?

5. I would suggest accruing more time and more numbers for the analysis, as 12 Ct infections are relatively few for the number of categories of covariates that are being examined for associations with Ct infection.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. In the last para of the Background the authors state that the aim of the study is to initiate a program for monitoring prevalence of Ct infection. However, the aim of this study is to establish Ct prevalence in this population. I suggest deleting this sentence, as well as reference to this as being the first phase.

2. Add to the last sentence "...health care needs of prisoners in this country, which has implications for prevention in the larger community."

3. Delete the 1st sentence of the Methods, there is little relevance to the STI awareness study.

4. Also delete all the detail about the Ct testing, and include just a reference to the laboratory methods.

5. Results and Table: In the text the authors state that 149 women were tested, however the table header includes only 143.

6. What was the reason for grouping Chad, Sudan, Nigeria, Eretria, and Egypt? Seems Ethiopia should not be its own category as 18% only 3% of women from there were Ct tested.
7. The women who used condoms for STI prevention versus pregnancy prevention -- are these mutually exclusive groups?

8. It would be easier to follow the text about what proportion of women from various countries were tested and tested positive if the authors presented numerator positive over denominator tested, with percent positive.

Discretionary Revisions:

1. First sentence of Background: Rather than say Ct is predominant in women, it's better to say that is affects women disproportionately. Second sentence: rather than screening "on time," you can say "screen early."

2. Last sentence of Discussion should say "conservative" instead of "conservation"
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