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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written paper about a study in a priority population with impressive results. I have a few minor comments and suggestions.

Discretionary revisions

1. Paragraph 2 in Methods overlaps slightly with some parts of the Introduction and I think would be better subsumed into the Introduction (eg line 81 and line 140 state the same facts, but use different references). Describing the population of interest in this study would fit better in the introduction, as would the policy context for this study which currently also sits in Methods (line 148-152).

2. Paragraph 4 in the Introduction (beginning line 100) – describes ‘primary health care centres’ and reports on Medicare data from GP visits (ref 16) which potentially covers ACCHSs and other services where GPs provide services that are not traditional general practices. It would be helpful, especially in an international journal, to explain that most ‘primary health care centres in Australia are in fact general practices, and also to report if available, any data about attendance by Aboriginal young people (16 – 29 years) specifically to ACCHSs compared with general practices (or other services, such as sexual health clinics or youth health services). This would better contextualise this study within this population and setting. This is also important for the Discussion (line 304) – the authors state that ‘...this may have resulted in our estimates of testing rates being an underestimation of the true testing rates’, and to be able to appreciate the possible scale of this would be useful.

3. Results – Attendance

Presumably the increase in number of 15 – 24 year olds attending was not significant? Attendance also relates back to my earlier comments about settings, range of primary health care services and testing rates – and what implications might be from this study to improve testing rates in the population (and not just within ACCHSs).

Minor essential revisions

I also noted several typographical errors:
Line 56 Logistic (regression - missing)
Line 101 ‘tail’ – tailor
Line 114 ‘Pediatric’ – British/ Australian spelling? And lower case?
Line 116 ‘The’ – this
Line 135 (called SHIMMER) – suggest remove brackets
Line 161 style comment: ‘how we extracted this data is described…’ suggest ‘the data extraction process is described…’
Line 381 ‘We would like to thank the…’ – ‘the’ is repeated

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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