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Reviewer's report:

I have seen the revised version of the manuscript and the author's reply to my questions. I have two small comments remaining:

- I commented on the fact that test results were available and that it would be interesting to link the positivity rate to the testing rate. I think the authors misunderstood my comment, thinking that they should look for consultations in patients who first tested positive to see whether the GP is more likely to test them again afterwards.

I meant the positivity rate at practice level: is a GP who works with a patient population who on average tests positive more often, or where more chlamydia infections are detected, inclined to test more, i.e. has a higher testing rate?

I still think it would be interesting to see that information, all the more so since the data are available.

- The other comment is whether patients can choose a specific GP when they come for consultation. I had in mind that there would be more GPs working in one general practice, as is often the case in my country. Then a patient can choose for a female or younger GP specifically when he/she comes for an STI consultation while at other occasions, e.g. for a broken arm, the patients would have no preference. Is this possible in Australia as well? If so, this may influence the outcomes of the study.
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