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Reviewer’s report:

Major Essential revisions

1. Line 79-82: The main finding of our previous work in this area (Abbott et al (2013) which you have referenced in your paper (10)) was that PNs may be interested in working in sexual health, including in screening, however GP attitudes to this and orientation of practice systems were significant barriers and more support was needed for the PN role. This previous study involved interviews with 10 PNs and 9 GPs and the paper specifically examined the issue you are also examining in your paper. Therefore I don’t think it is correct to say that GP views on this have not been investigated, and instead to cite an unpublished observation, particularly given that the results presented are similar. You may find the article also relevant in your discussion. You do say in the abstract and the discussion that this is the first qualitative study on this issue, which could be seen to be true in that the topic of your paper is chlamydia screening specifically, however work which aligns needs to be better incorporated, into the discussion as well.

2. I think the limitation that this is likely to be a biased sample as these GPs were already taking part in a trial on chlamydia testing is important. You have stated this in your limitations in a fairly generic way, acknowledging both that participants who agreed to an interview may have had a greater interest in sexual health and that being in the ACCEPt study means they may not have been representative. However in the context of your finding that almost all respondents are very positive and supportive of an increased PN role in chlamydia testing I think you need to more explicitly comment on your participant group. You could clarify in the methods / results whether and in what proportions the purposely selected interview subjects came from both arms of your study, or which of these had taken part on the PN arm of the study, or alternatively comment on this issue in the discussion.

Minor changes

3. Line 138: The range and median duration of the interviews should be noted
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