This paper aimed to identify risk factors for acute hepatitis C infection in Egypt. Although the manuscript cannot be considered very original, as many previous studies have already faced this subject, however, only a few have been performed in developing countries and have been based on case-control studies including patients with newly acquired infection. Moreover, the results of the current study regarding the importance of the risk factors for HCV infection might have a direct impact on the development of strategies to reduce population exposure to HCV infection in Egypt.

1. The study issue is well-defined.
2. The methods appear appropriate and well-described
3. The data are scientifically sound.
4. The manuscript adheres to relevant standards for reporting and data deposition.
5. The discussion and conclusions are well balanced and adequately supported by the data
6. Limitations of the paper are not clearly stated: the choice of laboratory criteria for defining acute hepatitis C need to be better discussed and compared to other previous studies.
7. The authors clearly acknowledge previous experience regarding the problem.
8. The title and abstract accurately reflect the study results.
9. Perhaps, the paper should be revised by a native English speaker to improve its readability.

Major Compulsory Revisions
The authors state that CDC criteria were utilized for definition of acute hepatitis C infection. However, at the reported web site (www.cdc.gov/epo/dphsi/casedef/hepatitiscacutecurrent.htm) (reference 13), an AST level >400 UI is indicated, corresponding to a minimum of 10 fold than the upper normal limits, while a 7 fold level has been used in the present study.

Can the author justify this choice or furnish a more accurate reference for the criteria used for case definition? The potential risk that patients with a chronic hepatitis C in course of reactivation (rather than an acute infection) might have been included in the analysis, due to the low level of the transaminase increase
used as inclusion criteria, should be acknowledged and this limitation requires adequate discussion in the paper.

Minor Essential Revisions

Table 1. Third line: indication of No. and % should be placed below the row indicating mean age and standard deviation, as it refers to all of the following data, while a row indicating Mean and ±SD could be added instead.
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