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Reviewer's report:

General
This a relevant survey of practice of HCV management in the UK with a sufficient answering rate and a straightforward methodology.

The Authors should probably emphasize some of the most burning issues including screening and therapy for which the gap appears greatest as compared to developed country standards in the EU and/or USA, Canada, Australia.

As far as therapy is concerned:

1) They should remind what is the current therapy recommendation in the UK (Nice) versus consensus conferences statements in USA, EU, and individual member states policies like France.

2) They should discuss the practice differences observed versus those standards of care.
   It is indeed some what surprising that PEG IFN is not more widely used instead of standard IFN.

3) The issue of liver histology request among barriers to therapy must be clarified since it is equally discordant among responders in table 5. Are the answers related to subgroup category (ID vs Hepatologists)?

4) A significant proposition of responders indicate that they would treat child B cirrhosis (48+9 % may be) and 16 % those waiting for liver transplants.

Is this discrepancy linked to whether or not the sites interviewed are linked or not to a transplant program on site, or in close collaboration.

The Discussion should be more focused.

Minor corrections are warranted

- Table 3 left column ainline % with category
- Table 5 last column strongly disagree

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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)
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
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