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Reviewer’s report:

Overall Comments
The manuscript is improved after the careful revision. However, the manuscript still requires a careful proofread. In addition, the manuscript would be further improved by addressing the following questions/concerns.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

Abstract:
1. Introduction: The authors might revise the second sentence to read: “Yet, data on the effectiveness and factors impacting implementation of PN in the Netherlands are lacking” given that the focus of the current study.
2. Conclusions: The recommendations for future steps are quite broad – can the authors be more specific in their recommendations?

Manuscript Text:

Introduction:
1. Please provide background for the legal context regarding PN in the Netherlands – is it mandatory?

Methods:
1. How were participants reimbursed for their participation in the study?
2. Please clarify the role of the STI nurses in performing partner notification – does this include outreach efforts or by telephone/in-person alone? Or are there other public health staff who perform this role? This is relevant for improving implementation of PN (see below, comment 4)

Discussion:
3. The authors report that data regarding PN are not collected but then state “Currently, almost all notifications at the Dutch STI clinics are carried out by patients (i.e. patient referral), and not by care professionals” – is this just based on anecdotal data?
4. Given that the findings suggest that face-face conversations may be more effective, might this suggest a role for outreach testing of partners (again, akin to the role of Disease Intervention Specialists as outlined by the United States-based Centers for Disease Control and Prevention)?
5. There is no mention in the results or discussion regarding experiences with PN in the context of heterosexual vs. homosexual partners – have differences been noted based on risk groups? If so, does this have implications for the recommendations?
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