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Reviewer’s report:

Thanks for letting me review this paper on a topic which is a bit out of my expertise and therefore my critique should be viewed with this in mind. I will try to respond to points given by the editorial board as of what follows:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Actually there is no question posed by the authors in this paper and I encourage authors to rephrase the last para of the introduction to include one or two questions = minor essential revision

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes they seem so to be

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
   Yes

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   I guess so

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes, however I sense another limitation re that the results may be perceived as risking to stigmatise the EM groups with the highest STI incidence - can something be done to neutralise this ? = discretionary revision

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   I guess so, yet I miss national data on STIs in NL and in the respective countries
of origin of the biggest EM groups = minor essential revision

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Not enough - I miss numbers in the abstract like ORs and/or maybe a comparison telling us how many of the GP patients were of ethnic minorities and how many % of people with the STI Codes were of ethnic minorities and how many were Dutch = Minor essential revision

10. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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