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Reviewer's report:

This is a much better manuscript and a far more interesting read compared with the first version. Well done on the revision. The rationale for developing this product in South America, and its role even with the introduction of the new hep C drugs, is clearly explained. Overall, the English grammar is now of the standard required for publication. The methods are appropriate and the results have been interpreted correctly, with the conclusions justified. My only major comments is that the PK profiles in Figures 1 and 2 have not been improved - these still look very poor.

Line 54, change 'marker' to 'market'.

Line 245, remove the word 'was'.

Line 247, should read 'was similar to others used in previous studies'

Figures: These are still of very poor quality and have not been improved as I suggested in the original review - there is no response to this in the letter of response. These 2 Figures are the most important aspect of the manuscript, and the authors should attempt to make them look exceptional.

In my opinion, this manuscript is acceptable for publication if these changes are made.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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