

January 9, 2017

To Whom It May Concern:

Formal Response to Reviewers:

Reviewer #1:

Review #1 had many well-thought responses to the manuscript and I appreciate the input that he/she provided. First off, there were a number of grammatical edits that were identified. This included only having one space after a sentence and a few wording edits. I have made all of these corrections and appreciate the corrections. She suggested a few other wording issues, such as splitting sentences in two and others. Those changes were made. The main question from Reviewer #1 was on Table 4. She was wondering how we had made the calculations. I have changed the wording on the table slightly to make this more apparent, and there were a few typos in the numbers that have now been corrected. I believe the improvements have made it more clear.

Reviewer #2: No specific comments or revisions were suggested.

Reviewer #3:

1. *The following sentences in the abstract is not clear and should be revised: "This retrospective analysis reviewed the work completed by the clinical pharmacist in order to measure the aims identified for the study;" i.e., please clearly stated the aims of the study.*

The authors have reviewed the abstract and respectfully disagree with the reviewer's suggestion. In the "AIMS" section of the abstract, the aims of this study are clearly written and we do not feel that they need to be repeated after this sentence.

2. *Patients with more advanced cirrhosis (Child B or C) are at risk for liver failure if prescribed DAA regimens that include NS3/4 inhibitors. How often did the pharmacist have concerns for the stage of cirrhosis and whether the DAA regimen recommended should not include the NS3/4 drug?*

This is a very interesting question, though it was not explored in this analysis. The clinical pharmacist worked with the providers to assist in selecting the optimal HCV regimen for the patients, but it was not recorded how often the pharmacist specifically recommended a regimen change due to stage of liver disease. Therefore, the manuscript cannot

answer this question. This would be an excellent question to explore as additional research.

The authors are appreciative of the reviewer's comments and suggestions and have made revisions to the manuscript.

Cordially,

Jacob Langness, PharmD