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Reviewer's report:

Comments Reviewer: Major Compulsory Revision

I have reviewed the manuscript “Schistosomicidal, hepatoprotective and antioxidant activities of the methanolic fraction from Clerodendrum umbellatum Poir leaves aqueous extract in Schistosoma mansoni infection in mice” However I have the following comments:

1. The section of “Background” is well organized and it was sustained by updated reference.

2. In the subsection “Animals and Infection” in the section “Methods” authors should explain why they are using these animals (BALB/c mice) with those characteristics. In this subsection, authors should include apart an ethical section subheading

3. In the subsection “Experimental design” in the section “Methods” authors should be more specific (description of the method used to categorize the mice treatment groups, dose treatment administered and treatment period).

4. In the subsection “Eggs count in faeces, intestine and liver” in the “Methods” section Authors should describe how the entire organs were removed for eggs recovering and counting process

5. In the subsection “Effect of the methanolic fraction from Clerodendrum umbellatum leaves aqueous extract on body and organs weights” in the section “Results and discussion” there are some sentences or paragraphs which require redaction. In addition, some sentences may be removed.

6. In the subsection “Effect of the methanolic fraction from Clerodendrum umbellatum leaves aqueous extract on worm burden and egg load” in the section “Results and discussion” there are some sentences or paragraphs which require redaction or they may be removed.

7. In the subsection “Effect of the methanolic fraction from Clerodendrum umbellatum leaves aqueous extract on liver function” in the section “Results and discussion” recommendations are similar than those in the points 5 and 6.

8. In the subsection “Effect of the methanolic fraction from Clerodendrum umbellatum leaves aqueous extract on some markers of oxidative stress” in the section “Results and discussion” similar recommendations are given.

9. Some written material in the points 5, 6,7 and 8 may be removed from the
current sections, but added in the “Methods” section to justify the measurements to carry out.

10. Redaction is required for the entire “Results and discussion” section. It too long and it requires being brief and clear. In addition, authors should be clear when they are describing statistical differences during the comparison among treatment groups.

11. Titles of the tables should be self-explanatory and “p” values should be included in the table.

12. The “Reference” section is too long. The editorial committee will take the final decision.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited.

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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