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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have presented a well described and well designed study of repeat testing of Chlamydia and gonocococcus positive individuals in a region of NZ. Repeat positivity is important due to increased risks of serious sequelae and may indicate inadequate/lack of partner treatment and increased population spread can be the consequence.

The study shows a similar range of repeat positivity as similar studies in NZ, and Australia, and also shows (consistent) with past studies. The design is appropriate and well detailed. The findings are appropriate to the data.

Minor comments

Abstract

full organism names in italics please

nzdep - explain in diff way for abstract

ln 22 - full organism names should be italics

ln 65 - sentence wording needs fixing

line 73 perhaps remove 'in best practise'

lien 81 - cite recent paper on blips fron De vries group here please

line 109 - organism names in italics

line 182-3 - numbers don't seem to match the lower chart boxes in fig 1?
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Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review
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