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Reviewer's report:

This study provides important information regarding the acceptability and cost of home retesting for chlamydia. I have a few comments to improve clarity of the study.

ABSTRACT:
1) Please provide the statistical methods used in the abstract. The authors only state that comparisons were made and in the results report a p-value as a measure of association.

INTRODUCTION:
No comments. This was well written.

METHODS
1) Can the authors please clarify if there were any inclusion/exclusion criteria for the RCT?

2) The statistical methods were fairly simplistic. Given that chi-square was used to compare frequencies between groups, the authors need to revise the use of the word "association". Chi-square test is not a measure of association.

3) Based on some of the sample sizes reported in the results, chi-square would not be appropriate and rather Fishers exact should have been used. The authors need to clarify whether this was done and if not what was the justification?

RESULTS
1) Although the authors state there are no baselines differences between groups, it would be beneficial to the reader if the authors provide some basic demographics of their study population (age range, living situation, etc.)

2) Again the statistical method used is not a measure of association. Reported associations (preferred retesting strategy paragraph) need to be revised to better reflect the statistical methods used.

3) What were the preferences for home vs. clinic testing for the clinic arm of the trial?

DISCUSSION
1) I am not sure the following statement is reflected by the reported results: “and home-based retesting was preferred to clinic-based testing by the majority of participants” – in the results preferred retesting strategy was only reported for the home-arm, so doesn’t that statement reflect those in the home-arm rather than those in the clinic-arm?

2) Do the authors expect any bias as a result of the un-blinded nature of the study?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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