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Object: MS: MS: 2037671906198646- “A study of best positive predictors for sustained virologic response to interferon alpha plus ribavirin therapy in naive chronic hepatitis C patients”. Dr. Muhammad Idrees and Dr. Sheikh Riazuddin.

Thank you for consideration of our manuscript for publication in your esteemed journal.

We have again reviewed the above manuscript according to the reviewer’s (Giuliano Ramadori) comments. Our revisions and responses appear below:

Reviewer’s report

Title: Studies on best positive predictors for sustained virologic response to interferon alpha plus ribavirin therapy in Naive Chronic Hepatitis C Patients

Version: 3 Date: 10 December 2008

Reviewer: Giuliano Ramadori

Reviewer’s report:

Upon your request to comment on (i) whether the reviewer’s concerns are justified and thus whether they should preclude the publication of the paper and (ii) the suitability of the paper for publication:

To my view, the comments of the reviewers are fully justified. However, both minor and major issues were not seriously enough addressed by the authors. For instance, there are still many spelling and grammar mistakes within the text. The text might have been edited twice by a native speaker as stated by the authors in their reply, but probably not by somebody with a sufficient scientific background. Regarding that point, the authors should have made demand on a more professional help.

Thanks to reviewer for accepting the responses to critiques submitted against the second versions review. As advised by reviewer this time the text of article was checked and edited again by a Native English man with sufficient scientific background (US NIH). All the spelling and grammatical mistakes were corrected.

Another point is the multitude of minor mistakes and inconsistencies which are still not completely corrected. For instance, a mistake in Table 1 although stated by the authors to be corrected (‘the percentage of genotype 3 females is not
18.78’) is still present.

As advised by reviewer this time all the other minor mistakes were completely corrected including TABLE 1.

Regarding major concerns, i.e. largely confirmatory results and the suggestion to focus on the ethnic differences in responsiveness, have not been adequately addressed.

Suggestion well taken and addressed differences in responsiveness in ethnic groups in more detail in ‘Result section’ page 9 lines 6-11 under heading “Virologic response in different ethnic groups”; Page 10 lines 6-8 under heading “Predictors of sustained virologic response” Further it is discussed and compared with Indian Panjabi ethnic group patients in ‘DISCUSSION SECTION’ page 13 lines 10-22. Further details are given in TABLE 4 on the subject.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being Published.

Done

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

Best regards
Idrees