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Reviewer's report:

Comments Reviewer:

I have reviewed the corrected manuscript “Schistosomicidal, hepatoprotective and antioxidant activities of the methanolic fraction from Clerodendrum umbellatum Poir leaves aqueous extract in Schistosoma mansoni infection in mice” 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. It was done

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). It was done

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. It was done

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. It was done

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. It was done

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. It was done

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. It was attended

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. It was done

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. It was revised

11. Titles of the tables should be self-explicative and “p” values should be included in the table. It was done.

The manuscript can published in the current form, but is subject to final decision of the editorial board.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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