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Author's response to reviews:

We are grateful to both referees for their reviews and comments. We have considered them carefully and have made changes accordingly. Below we detail the changes made taking each referee's comments in turn.

Jan Hendrik Richardus
We thank this referee for drawing attention to the publication by Hanalore Gotz and colleagues. We were aware of this work from having seen presentations on it at scientific meetings, but we were not aware that it had been published. We have included reference to it in both the background and discussion sections. By extending the second paragraph of the background section we have, as this referee suggested, also used it and some other references to indicate more vividly the ways in which chlamydia testing might impact on anxiety and self esteem.

Veerakathy Harindra
1. This referee suggested that 'The authors have not stated how they choose their study population'. We fully accept that this could have been clearer and in the Study Population sub-section we have rewritten the first paragraph to make explicit that, for both the cohort and cross-sectional elements of the study, individuals were chosen using stratified random sampling.
2. With regard to this referee's concern about the lack of demographic data on responders and non responders we have extensively revised the second paragraph of the Results section to provide relevant data on this issue. Moreover we have provided further references to a paper and a full report where this matter is discussed in some detail.
3. The referee stated that 'Based on the data presented I do not feel that a firm conclusion could be made regarding postal screening for Chlamydia'. In contrast Jan Hendrik Richardus wrote that 'The conclusions are well balanced and adequately supported by the data.' In the light of these conflicting views we have reviewed the paper again and remain content that there is sufficient evidence presented to support the conclusions drawn, especially since the limitations have been fully discussed. Furthermore, the new reference helpfully suggested by Jan Hendrik Richardus reached similar conclusions to ours based on work in the Netherlands. Without specific indication as to where the evidence gap lies in this paper (and again bearing in mind the first reviewer's comments) our reconsideration of this point has not led us to alter the conclusions.