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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editorial board,

Thank you very much for the review of our manuscript entitled: ‘Trends in antimicrobial management of gonorrhoea by general practitioners in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, between 2010 and 2015’.

We are grateful for the constructive comments and suggestions of the reviewers, and we include a point-by-point reply. The revised version of the manuscript contains all revisions described below. We hope that the current version of the manuscript has become suitable for publication in BMC Family Practice.

Sincerely yours,

Roos van Amerongen, MD

dr. Roel P. Gazendam, MD

Prof. dr. Jan E.A.M. van Bergen, MD
rsvanamerongen@gmail.com
rgazendam@gmail.com
jvanbergen@soaaids.nl

Technical Comments:
Figure - Please remove figure titles inside the figures, provide a figure legends after the reference list instead.

We removed the figure titles inside the figures and provided a figure legends after the reference list instead.

Editor Comments:

This article is suitable for publication but reviewer 3 has pointed out a number of typos. Please could you correct these. The article does not require further review

We are very grateful to the reviewers for the positive comments and suggestions. The comments have been processed in the manuscript.

BMC Family Practice operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Joseph Lee (Reviewer 1): Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

SC Chen (Reviewer 2): Nil.

Lisa M McCarthy, PharmD MSc (Reviewer 3): Thank you for considering and addressing the comments and suggestions. The impetus for the study, description of the methodology, and presentation of the results now more clearly lead the reader to the study’s conclusion.

Two additional comments to consider:

a) Line 120 (clean version): Consider adding a reference regarding the HIV window period
We agree with the reviewer and we added the reference.
b) Line 180 (clean version): Please specify the timeline on the 'whole period' as 12% is not reflective of the sum of combining the non-blue (i.e. non-cefotaxime or ceftriaxone) bars on the graph from 2010 to 2015.

We thank the reviewer for this observation and specified the sentence. The percentage treated with alternative antibiotics mentioned in this sentence, however, is not the sum of the combining non-blue bars on the graph as the total number of treated infections differ per year. The total number of alternative treated infections is the sum of the numbers documented in Additional Table 3b (34 cases were treated with alternative antibiotics, which is 12% of the total included cases n=279).

A few further suggestions to refine the writing mechanics include:

a) Line 59: add a comma after 'So far'

We added a comma.

b) Line 63: add a plural possessive apostrophe to 'GPs' (i.e. studied GPs' prescriptions)

We added a plural possessive apostrophe.

c) Line 70: move 'yet' to before 'been investigated'

We changed the sentence.

d) Line 73: change 'nucelin' to 'nucleic'

We changed the sentence.

e) Lines 74-75: combine the sentences by changing to "...alternative administration, such as GPs' experiences with..."

We changed the sentence.

f) Line 89: change 'higher' to 'relatively high'

We changed the sentence.

g) Line 120: consider using "HIV window period' instead of 'phase'

We changed phase in to period.

h) Line 208: add 'are' before 'early adopters'

We changed the sentence.
i) Line 226: change 'higher' to 'high'

We changed the sentence.

j) Line 227: consider changing to '…not representative of all areas of the nation' or '…not representative of all jurisdictions'

We changed the sentence.

k) Line 228: change 'noticed' to 'noted'

We changed the sentence.

l) Line 232: add a comma after 'conclusions'

We added a comma.