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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript describes and discusses the information that is available, and more importantly not available, on extra-genital testing for Chlamydia trachomatis and Neisseria gonorrhoeae in men and women. It is an extremely useful document, is clearly written and well referenced and easy to read. I have no specific comments for the authors but have a few thoughts they might like to consider.

1. The authors make it clear throughout the manuscript that there is little known about the morbidity caused by asymptomatic infection at extragenital sites particularly for CT. However, I have been challenged following presentations on this subject about what evidence we have that CT in the rectum or throat are 'pathogens' when they are causing an asymptomatic infection. To my knowledge there is little or no evidence that CT strains causing asymptomatic infections at extragenital sites are any different from genital sites. The authors may want to consider whether adding a phrase for the less informed reader that there is no evidence that CT strains from different sites differ in their pathogenic potential would be beneficial.

2. Page 6, lines 46-50: The sentence starting 'The lack of clearance...' is absolutely true. While many have adopted using these tests there may still be those that remain resistant to using these tests without the appropriate regulatory procedures in place and the authors may want to consider following this sentence with a statement that good validation data is available and the tests have been shown to be robust or something similar.

3. Page 10: the discussion here around the additional cost of testing samples from extra-genital sites is interesting. In the UK, and I believe in Europe, there has been a number of studies initiated (but as far as I am aware not published) where multiple swabs from different sites have been placed or expressed into a single collection fluid for testing to reduce the cost. This is, of course, not covered by current FDA or EU approvals but it would be interesting to know if the authors have any knowledge of this or any experience of it and want to express this in the text.
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