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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. Line 135: Could you provide a reference to any outputs from SHIMMER please? If there are none then perhaps a reference to your study website? Some further information about SHIMMER and STRIVE and their relationship to this study would be useful for readers. Currently I think it is unclear exactly how the three parts relate to each other.

2. Lines 140 to 152: I think this section should be placed in the background section. It does not really relate to methodology but is useful in setting the context for the study.

3. Section titled “Quality improvement program”: I think that this section could more clearly explain the QIP components. Currently it is difficult to fully understand and, I think, would not enable other researchers to develop an equivalent intervention, nor to assess comparability to their own QIPs. In particular, what were the distinct components; what indicators of success were used; how was training delivered to staff; how frequently was data fed back to staff; how many visits were made and by whom; what strategies were developed; how were strategies implemented; who delivered the training and why were they chosen?

4. Line 169: Could you expand on the importance and impact of having the meetings delivered by an Aboriginal man please. I suspect this draws on theories of communication/ peer-led interventions/ homogeneity/ diffusion of innovations/ popular opinion leaders but it would be important to acknowledge this if other researchers are going to develop similar models.

5. Line 362: Again, I do not feel that the QIP process has been adequately explained and therefore could not be introduced by others into primary health care services. Please elaborate on the process and be explicit in what the components are.

6. What are the limitations of the study?

Minor Essential Revisions:
7. Line 56: I think that the word “regression” is missing from this sentence.

8. Line 75: Reference [2] is from 2008. This could be updated with more recent diagnosis rate data from Public Health England. The 2013 datasets are currently available online.

9. Line 93: The UK guidelines that have been referenced do not recommend annual testing of 16 to 24 year old females as stated by the authors. The reference used gives advice on which type of specimen should be used. I wonder if it would be better to reference the National Chlamydia Screening Programme guidance which recommends opportunistic screening in sexually active 15 to 24 year olds (male and female) annually or on change of sexual partner.

10. Line 96: It was not clear to me which organism testing is recommended for in Aboriginal people – chlamydia or gonorrhoea.

11. Line 101: is “tail” the correct word to use here?

12. Line 104: Consider using (ACCHS) after the first use of Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Services and then continuing to use the abbreviation thereafter.

13. Line 113: Is there a suitable reference that could be used for the definition of quality improvement programme?

14. Line 116: The sentence beginning “The was achieved…” should begin with “This”.

15. Line 119/120: Should there be some extra words before “…described above…” in the sentence “In Australia, a sexual health QIP used a similar process (to the one) described above…”?

16. Line 124: Were these financial incentives?

17. Lines 179 and 236: spelling of gonorrhoea

18. Line 179: March 2012 to February 2013

19. Line 180: March 2010 to February 2011

20. Lines 188, 202, 203 and 284: six and not “6”

21. Line 196 and 286: two and not “2”

22. Line 203: July to November

23. Line 238: p=0.05 or less

Discretionary Revisions

24. Do you have any health economics analysis?

25. What was the potential impact of the researchers (person, and visits) on
testing rather than the QIP components?

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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