

Point-by-point response to the reviewer comments

We are grateful that all referees valued the issue addressed in our manuscript and found it well written. The comments of the reviewers were most helpful to improve the quality of our manuscript.

Reviewer 1:

No comments

Reviewer: 2

This concise review gives us a current perspective of the interferon-free treatment of hepatitis C virus-associated liver cirrhosis and post transplant liver graft infection. Although it is well written, the paragraph construction is a little hard to follow in ‘Antiviral therapy in HCV liver graft infection’ section. The paragraph titles lack coherence. And the conclusion is lengthy. It would be better to divide into Summary section and a short conclusive comment as Conclusion section.

We thank the referee for the critical and well-balanced discussion. The respective paragraphs have been revised and shortened according to recommendations. Moreover, the paragraph addressing velpatasvir was moved with respect to the meanwhile effected approval (see pages/lines 9/4 ff, 10/24 ff, 12/18 ff, 13/25 ff, and 16/25 ff).

Reviewer: 3

I would recommend editage for language correction. Overall, interesting article with good methodology presenting review about most current prospective trials and cohort analyses for treatment of patients with liver cirrhosis and liver graft recipients with Interferon-free treatment.

We appreciate that the referee found our manuscript interesting and valued the methodical literature search. The language evaluation by the 3 referees were “Grade A: Priority publishing” (referee 1), “Grade A: Priority publishing” (referee 2), and “Grade B: Minor language polishing” (referee 3). We carefully revised the manuscript with respect to British English standards.