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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editors,

We revised our manuscript “Factors influencing adherence in Hepatitis-C infected patients: a systematic review”. All changes were marked yellow.

However, the paper is sometimes quite difficult to read. The English and writing needs to be carefully checked so that the authors do not need to make quite important effort to understand. There are some sentences that are very unclear or that I even do not understand: I give 2 examples below:

Method section : "All data in the tables were commutated so that the influence on adherence refers to an increase of the respective factor, independent from whether the factor is positive (e.g. educational level) or negative (adverse events). I.e. higher risk ratios (RR) respectively odds ratios (OR) mean lower adherence in the reference group. E.g. in a comparison of higher versus lower age, a higher OR indicates a higher adherence in older age.” I have difficulties in understanding the link between the 2 sentences and what the authors exactly mean in the second sentence

In Discussion, page : The actual influencing factor, underlying phenomena, confounder, intermediary or effect modifier can therefore be concealed. but cannabis users were statistically significant more likely to continuing treatment [25].

Response: we tried to simplify the sentences were it appears difficult to read and the paper was copyedited by the native speaker of our team (SA).

In the result section, presenting the results on influencing factors with the verb "seems" (such as " Depression seems to have negative effect on adherence"). Is not appropriate. The authors should rather presents what they observed independently of the a causal judgment at this stage. So I recommend that all findings including "seems" be written as follow: "We found a negative (or positive) association between factor x and adherence”. However, in the discussion and conclusion I do not see any problem that the authors use "seems" to put their result in perspective for clinical practice since they take into account the study
limitations.
Response: we deleted seems and adapted the suggestion in the results section.

Please indicate source of funding of the study
Response: we added the source of funding under competing interests.

Copyediting:

We recommend that you copyedit the paper to improve the style of written English. If this is not possible, you may need to use a professional language editing service. For authors who wish to have the language in their manuscript edited by a native-English speaker with scientific expertise, BioMed Central recommends Edanz (www.edanzediting.com/bmc1). BioMed Central has negotiated a 10% discount to the fee charged to BioMed Central authors by Edanz. Use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of acceptance for publication. For more information, see our FAQ on language editing services at http://www.biomedcentral.com/authors/authorfaq/editing.
Response: the paper was copyedited by the native speaker of our team (SA).