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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary revisions:
1- In background, last paragraph:
   “This study examined......diagnosed with Chlamydia trachomatis( Ct)” Where? in GPs and/or STI clinics?

2- In recruitment:
   Could you explain why 42 care professionals were selected?

3- In methods, data collection, last paragraph:
   Although semi-structured, the body of the questionnaire should have a number of questions. This number should be mentioned in the paper

Minor essential revisions:
1- In discussion, recommendations and conclusions:
   Since in the results section the findings of perceived organisational barriers are:
   “no feedback on the effectiveness of PN outcomes and PN techniques used were available”
   I would expect a more exhaustive proposal to overcome this weakness and make sure that effectiveness of PN can be further evaluated

2- In discussion, last paragraph:
   “The interviews made......no uniform guidelines...” There are ECDC and CDC guidelines that although have some differences they should be mentioned and Referenced

3- In conclusion:
   Not sure that this study can be named “national” since doesn’t seem to have enough sample exhaustivity
   “Providing feedback”: is it another way to say evaluated? How do you propose to do the evaluation of effectiveness of PN?

Major Compulsory revisions:
none
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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