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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for including the vast majority of suggestions made in the previous review. Below are some more suggestions for improving the quality and robustness of the manuscript.

Table 1 and 2: Please, represent the data as mean and SD.

It is very important to compare if the process of acetylation of phenolic compounds, besides improving the activity can interfere in the toxicity of the compounds, reducing or not the selectivity index (IC50 HepG2 cel / IC50 P. falciparum). Therefore, I suggest that the authors calculate the selectivity index for the compounds and include the data in the results, as well as an appropriate discussion for these data.

See below some references.


The statistical analysis in this work is relevant and needs to be used mainly to compare the results with the different cells used. However, the authors only presented values of mean and SD, without making an appropriate statistical analysis.

Answer: Thanks, but we think that mean and SD are the usual values given when reporting IC50 activity values. That is, we find our results in accordance with what is usually reported for such reports.

I agree with the authors mean and SD are the usual values given when reporting IC50 activity values. However, when comparing two groups (before and after the process of acetylation) a statistical analysis is strongly recommended.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Does the work include the necessary controls?  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English  
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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