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Reviewer's report:

General
This is an interesting study about an important topic in public health. The results are relevant (although not surprising) for those responsible for setting up screening programs.

The methods of the literature review is not well described. It is also difficult to understand how the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) has been used in the analysis.

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

None

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

The abstract could be improved, especially the methods part.

In the background section in the article I miss information about other reviews (if existing) regarding women's views on chlamydia screening, and how information about what women think has (not) been used in existing screening programs.

In the methods section the authors ought to give more detailed information especially about how the articles were selected and how the analysis was performed.

The inclusion criteria listed in the methods section are not fully consistent with the eligibility criteria in the methods part of the abstract.

There is no information if and how the quality of the articles was assessed, although it is reported that the quality of the studies reviewed varied considerably (p. 6).

It is stated that "We compared our thematic analysis with the TPB" - but I did not understand how this was done, or if this is relevant for the readers or those setting up screening programs.

Results section: It is not quite clear what is meant by studies including "a quantitative/qualitative component".

Table 1 presents each study that "included a qualitative component" in each row. They are all described as "qualitative studies". As a non expert in this field I do not know these studies, but I found that for instance ref. 10 France et al is a letter to the editor in BMJ describing a small cross sectional study and interviews with four women with positive test results, hence it is debatable whether it qualifies as a qualitative study.

Table 2 presents results of studies giving quantitative information regarding specific research questions. The number of studies informing each research question is stated, but it is not explained how the medians of responses are calculated.

It is unnecessary with separate reference lists for each of the tables, as all the studies included in the tables are included in the main reference list of the article.

The themes listed as factors promoting screening or making screening less acceptable seem reasonable (and not surprising), but it is not transparent how and why these themes were selected (better methods section wanted).

The variability of the quantitative studies is not reflected in the results section, where the themes are presented as if "women" in general agree on factors promoting screening or making screening less acceptable.

I do not find figure 2 particularly helpful, and the logic of the topics in the categories is debatable.

Discussion: It is not necessary to repeat the major findings given in the results section.
I agree that it is a limitation that the review only included studies in English, and that 98% of the studies were base in US/UK. The rest of the paragraph regarding limitations describes important aspects/variability of included studies that I do not consider as limitations of the review (women of different ages, half of studies on women < 25 years, some studies looked at the views of women with specific social problems, women of different ethnic backgrounds etc.)
The strength of recommendations based on qualitative studies is generally debatable, hence the recommendations based on these studies might be stated with caution.

Conclusions: should be shortened and made more explicit. The elements of the TPB do not belong here (especially since they have not been introduced earlier).

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: No
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