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**Reviewer’s report:**

Overall this was an interesting read, the methodology seems appropriate and the conclusions relevant and I have recommended it for publication.

I have a few suggestions that I think would strengthen the paper and there are quite a few minor changes that could clarify the English.

1. Incidence of gonorrhoea - I wonder if confidence intervals would add something? e.g. Fig 2

2. Trends - this is mentioned in the title so I was expecting a statistical assessment of trends. e.g. Antimicrobial Management - line 147 states infections treated with the correct antibiotics increased significantly, is this statistical significance? if so how was this calculated. I may be misinterpreting fig 3 as I have it in greyscale but it looks to me that the 2010 figure for cefotaxime plus ceftriaxone is about 81% and 2016 94%? (as opposed to 77% and 97% in the text) Could you check this?

3. Antibiotic treatment preferences: line 161 onwards, I prefer the use of 15/34 to percentage when the number is low, though this is arguably a personal preference and I note you have provided both.

4. For the international readership - is there anything beyond the described demographics that might be different/special about this part of Amsterdam? (There may not be, but I can imagine that as in many large cities there might be e.g. socioeconomic differences between areas)

**English:**

Whilst the English is of a high standard and completely understandable there are opportunities to polish it should the editors prefer to do so. Here is a list of suggestions. Sorry for being picky, these are offered in the spirit of trying to be helpful. :-)

Line 23: The Dutch guideline has recommended a single dose of....

Line 29: years 2010 to 2015

49: So far few cases of ceftriaxone-resistant gonococcal strains have been identified
52: delete 'one of the last blind'
55: ...the major part of STI care is provided by GPs
61: delete 'in particular'
62: demonstrated that the majority of GPs
95: in patients aged 15 years and older who received....
99: (a positive test in a sex partner)
106: ...obtained on the opinion of...
110: ...agreement with each statement...
116: Can you clarify 'annual report GAZO'
112: ...alternative antibiotic therapies... (I think this is important to clarify as 'alternative therapies' implies non-standard care e.g. homeopathy)
161: you could delete 'a total of" then say: 34 GPs were eligible for the survey to assess experiences...
185: Only 64% of GPs in 2010 administered antibiotics recommended for the treatment of gonorrhoea.
214: ...sample size in a highly urban area with a high prevalence...
216: not representative of the Netherlands.
218: ...coding errors which may have...
222: high prevalence area...

Fig 4: IM administration of cephalosporin (not Im)

Fig 4: Preference for single dose...

Fig 4: Preference for culture-based...
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