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Reviewer’s report:

1. The question posed by the authors is well defined. The costs analysis adds to the findings of the previous published work although the other outcomes seem very much secondary to the original publication. Given that the earlier data suggested that the home testing strategy was more effective I would question what additional impact measuring the secondary outcomes of acceptability would have on policy for retesting and why the health economics could not have been included in the original publication.

2. The methods are appropriate and well described - please clarify what additional steps were taken after the initial SMS to encourage participants to complete the study, how long the study remained open for the patients to complete.

3. The data appears to be sound. Although the baseline demographics in the two study groups are provided the data for those who did not respond to the survey is not included. Could the authors indicate whether there were any differences in the demographics of those who did not respond to the survey (presumably such data exists as they were part of the original study?)

4. The figures appear to be genuine and the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition.

5. The discussion and conclusions are consistent with the results and the aims of the study - my only reservation would be that the survey is likely to overestimate the acceptability of both forms of follow up as those who chose to respond may be a self-selected group.

6. The limitations of the work clearly stated and the authors acknowledge the results of the movie us REACT study upon which they are building.

the title and abstract accurately convey what is in the body of the text. The standard to the writing is acceptable.

Overall - I find no methodological problem with the study but feel it adds little the results originally published on the REACT study.

Minor revisions - essential

7. Please indicate what is known about the demographics of the study participants who did not respond to the survey.
discretionary revisions

8. Please discuss clarify how long the survey was open and whether any additional reminded were used to increase participation

9. Please discuss what is known from other studies on home STI testing on acceptability.
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