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Reviewer's report:

As the authors point out, while many are diagnosed with CT, their partners are not always treated (i.e., via notification and referral). As patients are the principal medium of notification and referral, it's reasonable to say that some sort of enhancement is needed to have any hope of PN playing a role in infection control. It's a good idea to ask people about new technologies - especially for widespread infections like CT (a fair bit of previous research has been MSM-centered - e.g., Mimiaga et al.).

The paper is readable, and the qualitative approach is helpful. So is the principle of asking actual CT+ patients!. I have minor points to make:

Minor Essential:


2. Can you clarify if everyone assumed they were the source case? It seemed that way from the quotes. No-one was quoted saying anything on the lines of "he/she gave *me* CT. Why would I be embarrassed?" Closest to that sentiment that I saw was F 23, Vic on p8. Interesting point to perhaps take up in the discussion.

3. p7: Tell the reader if SMS/email use was biased toward those with many partners. I'm gleaning that from the quotes, but you can be specific.

4. p18: Is the Bilardi paper from the same dataset? Please clarify (if the answer is no, we're set).

5. p20: Your text conclusion is more nuanced than the abstract, which more or less shunts technological method aside. These should match more closely than they do.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Shouldn't the Levine ref (16) be cited around p5?
2. p10: I got a little lost on the first read of the opinions section. although soem of that can be dealt with through typesetting, I advise adding a few words to the introductory comments along the lines of "...discussed personally with the partner *unless* ..." I know that's discussing your results before presenting them (some of which exists already), but that's OK in my opinion.
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