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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors showed the usefulness of storytelling video for educating HCV infection to opioid users. This study is interesting, and the manuscript is well written. 1. The authors should indicate P values in each Figure and Table. 2. In the future, it is important to evaluate whether the differences in educational modalities will lead to behavior changes, such as frequency to screen HCV infection, visit clinics, and receive DAA treatment. The authors should add the related comments.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is an interesting study investigating the impact of a story-telling narrative video to increase substance users immediate and 1-month HCV-related knowledge compared to a printed format. They conducted a prospective matched, case-control study among substance users actively prescribed buprenorphine enrolled from two sites. The intervention site received the video and the control site, the brochure. Knowledge was assessed by administration of a 25-item instrument immediately before, immediately after, or one month after the intervention. Overall, they recruited a total of 176 substance users, 90 and 86 individuals, from each site, respectively. One-month follow up occurred in 92% and 94% of enrolle in the control and intervention group, respectively. In comparison with the pre-intervention scores, immediate knowledge recall significantly increased significantly for both the intervention and control groups. Multivariate modeling revealed a significant improvement in HCV-related knowledge and retention (p=0.033) among participants who viewed the storytelling video. They concluded that storytelling narratives emphasizing HCV education appear to be an effective method to increase HCV-related knowledge among substance users. They suggested this approach as an educational cornerstone to promote HCV management among this population. The study is of interest and present novel findings and management approach. Methods and results are well presented. I have only minor points to suggest to further improve the clinical impact of the study. - It has been previously reported that alcohol intake may contribute to the worse prognosis of HCV-patients and this should be recalled as previously described and reported (Natural course of chronic HCV and HBV infection and role of alcohol in the general population: the Dionysos Study. Am J Gastroenterol.
2008 Sep;103(9):2248-53). Another clinically relevant topic to recall is the impact of a proper HCV management to avoid hepatocellular carcinoma occurrence and recurrence as previously demonstrated in a recent meta-analysis (A meta-analysis of single HCV-untreated arm of studies evaluating outcomes after curative treatments of HCV-related hepatocellular carcinoma. Liver Int. 2017 Aug;37(8):1157-1166).
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Talal et al. designed a prospective case-control study to assess the effect of video and brochure education on the knowledge of HCV in substance users in a total of 176 participants. The found improving scores in both groups after video and brochure education. Participants in the video education group had a milder degree of score decrease one month later, than those in the brochure group. 1. The major limitation of the study was the unusual design of the so called “prospective case-control study”. If the authors aim to assess the differences of two type of intervention on the outcomes, they just conduct the randomized study in all participants with 1:1 ratio and define the outcome assessment accordingly. Using age, sex and gender-matched to avoid potential confounders before two interventions are not enough, that means this study is prone to have selection biases to evenly distribute the potential factors affecting the knowledge of HCV, such as educational or socioeconomic status, history of HCV infection, vintage of drug uses etc... 2. It was still not clear about the sample size estimation in both groups. The authors stated a 60% differences in outcomes estimation. However, I was confused about the 60% differences (continuous variable or categorical variable improvement?). Did it mean score improvement differences or reach a specific cut-off improvement? Furthermore, it was not clear about the time point comparison for the outcomes (pre- vs. immediate post- or vs. 1-month post). Please clarify it. 3. If two groups of participants are well balanced, there is no need to use model adjustment, showing the parameter changes to confirm the authors’ assumption would be fine. To sum up, randomized controlled study would be the suitable design for such study.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
In this revised manuscript the authors satisfactorily addressed the raised points and the manuscript can be now accepted.