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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
   Yes the question is a very important and well define question. Is the sustained virologic response a cure of virus or not

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
   The authors use classical clinical and laboratory methods that are used in Western world too.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
   yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   yes

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   yes

7. Is the writing acceptable?
   yes

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

a better description of the histological determination by Knodell in terms of the histological activity index and fibrosis

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
I would be interested to know if there is a difference between the Interferon used (alpha 2a, 2 b or consensus) regarding the sustained response sustained at the end of the 10 years. It will be relevant if you can describe some gender differences.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No