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Reviewer's report:

General
Although the manuscript was improved in this revised version, I feel it still needs some changes as raised below.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. All the text still needs to be revised as far as the English language is concerned. For instance, the expression seric levels, at pages 9 and 10 should be replaced by serum levels. At page 11, the Latin name of tender oak, Quercus incana, should be in italic. It would be good to have a native English speaker to read the manuscript.
2. Methods: page 4 (end of the 1st paragraph)- I feel that it would be better to express the final decoction concentration in terms of solid residues/ml. This could be done by simply taking a 1 ml decoction sample in a weighted beacker and submitting it to evaporation in the oven at 60 oC. After the complete evaporation, the beacker is weighted again, and this gives the concentration of the decoction in solid residues/ml. The way the authors used does not give any idea about the amount of material extracted during the 5 min boiling process, what could vary from time to time.
3. Page 7, Statistical analysis: It is not clear why only the bilirubin data was analysed by unpaired Student’s t test.
4. Page 8, last paragraph of Results section: I think that the authors want to say that "treated and untreated rats grew at similar rates" (and not at similar rats).
5. Page 5, Decoction administration: It would be worthwhile to determine the amount of the decoction DT and NT groups drunk during the experimental procedure. It should be taken into account that tannins, compounds also present in Bauhinia forficata leaves, can be toxic compounds and, depending upon the amount taken, they can lead to death.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the authors can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: No
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