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Author’s response to reviews:

Based on reviewers’ reports and editorial comments, we have reviewed the paper’s structure and organization. First, we would like to reassure that the paper had been submitted within the article type “Debate”, which allows presenting an argument that is not essentially found on practical research. Therefore, we have decided to reorganize the paper into a broad structure comprised of background, main text and conclusions, according to BMC Public Health guidelines for Debate. In order to address the reviewers and editorial comments, we have added more information about the mathematical model and the search strategy for the literature review. Besides, we have clearly stated the objective of this paper, clarifying the approach as a debate of an experience report.

We have addressed each comment as follows:
Reviewer 1

1. The abstract was rewritten. The objective was clearly stated, and the approach was clarified as a debate of an experience report. The key message is for evidence-based policymaking.

2. Since the objective of this paper is to describe the process of evidence-informed policy concerning the implementation of the new treatment for hepatitis C in Brazil and the approach is a debate, we included the reference of the recently published mathematical model and briefly described the situation analysis that underlies the strategic response, focus of this paper. We clarified that the data are from national databases with individual registers. Details were added in relation to the mathematical model and the literature review, none of them objectives of this paper.

Since the structure was reformulated, we decided not to separate the paper into methods, findings, and neither discussion section.

Reviewer 2

1. We included mentions to Interferon along the paper.

2. The previous cost is according to the international market, and the pharmaceutical commercial proposals varied from medication to medication, so we reported the cost reduction in percentage.

3. We reviewed and corrected the references, including reference 7.

4. We included legends for the figures, particularly the graph 1.

5. The hypothesis for the increasing hospital admissions showed in graph 2 was stated in the text, as a probable result of the high prevalence.

Editorial comments

a) We clearly articulated the objective of this paper, provided more information on the mathematical model (including the bibliographical reference) and provided details on the search strategy for the literature review.