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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting paper, and highlights some of the current issues and potential future strategies in enhancing chlamydia screening from general practice clinics in Australia.

Major Compulsory Revision

Grammar - Introduction Last paragraph. Change to read "PN's have reported that they are willing to have an ..."

Grammar - Methods/Settings. First paragraph, last sentence. Clarify who got the training and who got the incentives. - also you refer to clinics from next paragraph onwards. So in this section, use general practice clinics as the full title.

Methods/ Settings. Last paragraph, last two sentences. Re-phrase - grammar issues. Also would an international reader understand the terminology "loading of up to 50%"? Strongly suggest you expand on this explanation.

Results and Discussion

39 of the 44 GPs interviewed were from rural part of Australia. This is of major importance in the whole paper - because issues faced in general practice, sexual health testing, barriers and access in Rural Australia are very different to Metro parts of Australia. A number of papers have been published to show this. I note that you have one sentence in the limitation, however I feel that these results of the study you have presented here are only valid for Rural Australia. Is there a way of illustrating which quotes were from Rural Australia and which quotes were from Metro Australia? Maybe the quotes are similar - and therefore findings could be extrapolated to whole of Australia.

It also contradicts the strength of study - "that GPs where from diverse range of clinics". No details on clinic size, geographic locations (postcode or ARiA index, SIFA index) have been provided to validate this point in the results section.

Another limitation is that this is a small sample size, and only provides a snapshot of opinions of GPs in ACCEPt trial. This point should be expanded on - with possible implications of how the findings of your study could be affected because of this.

The discussion is otherwise extremely well written, and appropriate to the audience and content of research. Well done.
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