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Author’s response to reviews:

We thank the editor and reviewers for their usefull comments that helped improve our manuscript.

Response to reviewers

Technical Comments:

1) As per PRISMA guidelines, the title must identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.

Authors response: The title has been changed and now reads: ”Generic Quality of Life in Persons with Hearing Loss: A Systematic Literature Review”.

2) In the Declarations section, for the "Availability of data and material", please refer to http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#availability+of+data+and+materials for a list of typical statements used.

Authors response: We have consulted the list of typical statements and this section now reads: Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Reviewer 3:
1) Abstract is adequate, but keywords should be re-evaluated. "Hearing" has been used overmuch.

Authors response: We have re-evaluated the list of keywords. To avoid over use of the word “hearing” we have edited the key word “hearing impairment” to “impairment”. Combined with the keyword “hearing loss” this should allow for searches for “hearing impairment” to locate the study in databases.

2) What is the clinical implications of the present study for researchers?

Authors response: Clinical implications are addressed at various sections of the discussion. These can be found here:

[Section: Discussion; Page: 17; Lines 12 – 17].

[Section: Discussion; Page: 18; Lines 11 – 18].

[Section: Discussion; Page: 18; Lines 22 – 24].

To improve clarity we have added a summary of these points under the Conclusions-section, located at [Section: Conclusion; Page 19; Lines 20 – 24]

3) Limitations of present study should be discussed at the end of discussion.

Authors response: We have moved the section describing the limitations of the study design from [Section: Discussion; Pages: 15 - 16; Lines 22 – 3] to [Section: Discussion; Page 19; Lines 4 – 12]. Also parts of this paragraph has been rewritten to improve clarity.

4) Conclusion should be re-written, it should be response the aim of the present study.

Authors response: We have re-written the conclusions-section. The section now more directly addresses the aims of the paper and their outcomes.