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Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. The authors have not stated how they choose their study population.
2. The over all response rates are low. Therefore it is possible that the study population would be the educated, motivated, health conscious people. This would not be representative of the at risk population. Although this limitation is mentioned in the discussion the authors should compare the demographic data between the respondents & non-respondents.
3. Based on the data presented I do not feel that a firm conclusion could be made regarding postal screening for Chlamydia

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes
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