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**Reviewer’s report:**

The authors describe the development of an innovative web-based application based on respondent driven sampling to target hard-to-reach youth for STI testing. They carefully describe the use of Intervention Mapping (IM) in the development process, which is helpful for readers who are unfamiliar with the IM process. Overall, the manuscript is well-organized with sufficient detail describing methods and results. However, it would benefit from careful editing by a native English-speaker as some phrases/statement are rather awkward.

**Minor Essential Revisions:**

Abstract – Background: In the opening sentence, clarify where the study took place. “Despite the availability of public sexual health care centers and general practitioners in the Netherlands...” Not all countries have “availability of public sexual health care centers and GPs.”

Methods – Step 1 Needs Assessment (p.6). The PRECEDE model is a key part of IM Step One; yet, it is not mentioned in Methods or Results. I would recommend including mention of it in both sections and possibly including a completed PRECEDE model for chlamida outcomes in this youth population as an additional figure. It would provide a useful example for other practitioners who may choose to use the IM process.

Results – Step 3 (p.11). Include Modeling as a method since there is mention of a modeling activity in Step 4 Results and it is listed on Table 4.

Results – Step 4 (pgs.11-12). In the Methods section, the authors described development of two websites – one for youth and one for “sexual health care professionals to oversee the recruitment process.” However, in the results section it’s difficult to discern what activities are featured in which website and how the two websites work together. Some more detail regarding the integration and functions of these two websites would be helpful. Also, it’s difficult to discern how exactly the websites are intended for use (e.g., where are they accessed, at home or during clinic visit or both? Who oversees youth’s use of the website – self-initiated/navigated, or is use guides by the health care professional).

Discussion (pgs. 14-15). “The intervention therefore facilitates both patient and provider referral...” Again, given the lack of clarity in the Results Step 4 section,
it’s not exactly clear how the intervention does both of these.

Table 2 PO 1. Some words appear to be missing from the PO – “PO1.1: Young people appraise CT”. Suggest rewording to “Young people appraise personal risk for CT.”

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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