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Jun 21, 2012

Dear Editor,

We have now revised our manuscript and addressed the reviewers' comments in a point-by-point response format (according to each individual reviewer). Please see below.

Please note that as requested by one of the reviewers, we have included the interview guide we used. We have included/uploaded this as a separate document.

If you or either of the reviewers have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at cindy.masaro@gmail.com or by phone at 604-376-6723.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Cindy Masaro

Response to Reviewer Julia Bailey's comments

Major Compulsory Revisions

- We have changed the analytic approach to reflect that a thematic analysis rather than a discourse analysis was conducted (see Analytic Approach - p. 7).

Minor Essential Revisions

- We have removed the reference to Options for Sexual Health (was on p.5).

Discretionary Revisions

- Methods section - the description of the nurse STI training program has been shortened and the significance more clearly stated (p. 5-6).

1.

- We have clarified the problem we are examining (p.5).
- We have made reference to the larger study but now positioned this study as a complete study in itself (p.5).
• Methods section - have changed this section to start with 'Settings and Participants' (p.5).
• We have added more detail about who conducted the interviews (p.6).
• We have added more detail about the steps taken in our data analysis. We removed the reference to NVivo as this was used to extract text from the interviews pertaining to our questions. As stated in the manuscript, subsequent coding was done manually (see p.7).

5.

• We have changed the discussion section (p. 18) to reflect the perceived shortcomings of STI service provision identified from the themes and removed references to the discourses.

6.

• Limitations were moved from the conclusion section to the end of the discussion section (see p.23).

8.

• The title has been changed to more clearly convey our findings

Response to Reviewer Catherine Mercer's comments

1.

• In the background section we have acknowledged that STI incidence and rate of infection is diagnosed incidence and diagnosed rate of infection (p.3).
• Reference to Options for Sexual Health has been removed (was on p.5).
• Rather than identify the geographic location where service providers worked, we have now identified the type of clinic setting in which they worked (see the Results section).

2.

• Interviewer guide is included as an appendix.
• The year (2006/2007) the interviews took place has now been added (p. 5).

5.

• In the discussion section we have included a comment about the fact that these findings are not necessarily unique to providing STI care for youth but rather may be applicable to STI service delivery in BC in general (p. 19).
6.

- In the first paragraph of the results section, we have added a sentence to acknowledge that our findings are not generalizable and relate only to STI service provision in BC (p. 9).

8.

- Title has been changed to reflect the geographical context.
- Abstract background section has been reworded to reflect the suggested changes---individuals seeking care for sexually transmitted infections
- Interview detail has been added to the methods section of the abstract
- We have changed the abstract conclusion to reflect the rest of the paper