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**Reviewer's report:**

Casillas-Vega et al report a study on the frequency and genotypes of Chlamydia trachomatis in patients attending the obstetrics and gynecology clinics in Jalisco (Mexico) and the correlation of this infection with sociodemographic, behavioral and biological factors. The topic is not innovative in itself, even if there is a lack of data in the area involved in this study. For this reason the final results of this study may be of some interest to the scientific community.

The general presentation of the manuscript is linear but some points require attention and revision by the Authors.

This reviewer thinks that deep attention could be done on "material and methods" section.

You have to better describe the experiments that you have done and described. For example:

Lines 125-134: how long is the fragment amplified?

Lines 141-142: are you sure of the amplification condition here reported?

This reviewer thinks it is necessary that the Authors explain why have decided to use three different methods for the detection of infection. What is the reference method? The gold standard? The three methods are concordant or discordant? It is possible to analyze the concordance / discordance of the results in relation to the characteristics of the study population?

It necessary to comment about these differences.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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 am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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