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Reviewer's report:

Debebe et al evaluated the anthelminthic activity of a well-known medicinal using both in vivo and in vitro test system. Authors also isolated the major compound found in the plant and examined same for biological activity. Given the health implication and economic loss arising from helminth infections, the current study is needed and important to both scientific community and general public. Apart from the concern about the limited data presented in the manuscript, the following revision is recommended to improve the manuscript

Major Compulsory Revision

Line 118 Phytochemical screening
If this aspect of the study is required by the authors, reference must be included for the tests. There is no indication of the phytochemicals targeted by the authors. Please amend accordingly.

Line 122: Isolation procedure
In the present form, I have serious concerns on the procedure outlined by the authors. It appears very superficial and I do know isolation procedure are often more intense and long. Authors need to clearly and meticulously present the isolation process used for the identified compounds. Also, authors must re-check their yields for correctness. Obtaining a pure compound (5 g) in 3 quick steps appears too simple and unrealistic. The purity of the isolated compound is missing and must be clearly stated. Please clarify what is meant by ‘hot’ ethyl-acetate and ‘cold’ hexane.

Line 239: Discussion
The discussion is too brief and superficial. Discussion relating to the phytochemical and safety evaluation observed in the study is completely missing. Authors must remove these aspects from materials and methods as well as the result section if is not important to their study.

Minor Revision

Abstract
Line 35: delete “Medicinal plants such as’
Line 39: Delete ‘generated to” and change ‘evaluate’ to ‘evaluated’
Line 54: delete ‘indeed’
Line 55-56: Rephrase sentence for clarity

Keywords
Avoid the use of word(s) which have appeared in the title to help improve the visibility of the manuscript after publication

Background: Authors need to improve on the language for better flow. Sentences must be properly synthesised to bring out the convey messages in a logical manner. Few examples are highlighted below:
Line 73-74: Both sentence can be easily synthesised nicely and combined for better flow.Background: The abbreviation FOM should be inserted in the second sentence. Thereafter, it should be deleted from first sentence under method section.
Lines 79-84: A very short paragraph which appears disjointed. The message can easily be incorporated with the one above.
Line 91: Insert a comma between ‘medicine’ and ‘scientific’
Line 92: Please replace the word ‘generate’

Methods
Line 111: Avoid starting a sentence with ‘number’
Line 114: delete ‘gummy’
Line 131: delete ‘very’
Line 148: please convert 2000 rpm to the SI unit (X g)

Results
Lines 208-209: remove the capitalisation of the phytochemicals
Line 231: insert space between number and units. Check and do same throughout the manuscript

Discussion
Line 240-242: The sentence add no value, more like a repetition from the introduction, I suggest deletion.

Conclusion
Perhaps, authors should considered merging as with discussion, the concluding statement is so predictable and shallow.

List of abbreviation
Please remove Standard abbreviations (e.g. microgram, microliter, LD50, etc) from the list

Figures: The caption for all the figure are not well explanatory and need to be improved to convey whatever message the authors want to convey.
Line 369: HPLC should be written in full
Figs 2 and 3: Authors must justify the relevance and value of having these
figures in the manuscript. Does it add any extra value to their work?

Table
In column 2, instead of repeating ‘Kg’ all the way, it can be captured in the column title “Dose administered (Kg)”
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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