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Reviewer’s report:

The topic of this manuscript falls within the general scope of this journal, and covers a very interesting subject. The paper deal with medicinal animals sold in public markets in two cities from NE Brazil.

Major compulsory Revisions:

a- General comment: In my view, some parts of the ms need enrichment in order to adequately provide a base and justification for findings. Is necessary an effort to relate the study to current hypothesis on the use of animals explaining, for example, why the insects are more sold, why osteomuscular system has the greatest ICF, etc. Discussions in general are missing in all around the text. In addition, the paper in its present form is not addressed to a broad enough audience.

b- Introduction: Objectives must be completed a lot. Why do not authors include the comparison between two cities? Authors have a lot of quantitative data to do that (see for example table 1).

c- I suggest replacing the term infirmities with ailments.

d- The method section must be improved adding more socio-cultural information. The reader need to know more about how is the traditional medical system in this semi urban context.

e- Please, include more details about the taxonomical identification of animals (names of specialist, literature, etc.). Please, where are the vouchers???

f- Data analysis: How were adapted ICF and UV? Please, explain.

g- The results are shown poorly and some parts are repetitive and must be improved.

h- Please, explain the term “simpatias”.

i- Table 3: Please, a brief description of each variable analyzed (e.i. specie total?use citation? Total citation?, etc.) is necessary.

I hope that these comments and questions are of help to the authors.
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