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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript "Retesting and repeat positivity following diagnosis of Chlamydia trachomatis and Neisseria gonorrhoea in New Zealand: a retrospective cohort study” provides useful data on reinfections of bacterial STIs and further emphasizes the importance of patient management in reducing the bacterial STIs. However, listed below are a few discretionary revisions to consider?

1. Do NZ guidelines or Health care ministry require mandatory contact tracing and treatment of partners? Please clarify.

2. Did the survey include questions about sexual orientation? Is there any information concerning this in the study population? Could men who have sex with men (MSM) be a factor associated to the higher positivity rate of Chlamydia and Gonorrhoea in the male population? MSM is not discussed at all in the manuscript. Lack of information about this could be a limitation. Please add this information in the manuscript.

3. All tables should be read independently of another. Please revise table 2 with the footnotes included in table 1 (where applicable).

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
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5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
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If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
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I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license ([http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.
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