

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78063
Title of the Manuscript:	'Silymarin' a potential treatment targeting hepatic fibrosis of schistosomiasis
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As similar study was performed ([8]), the authors should underline the novelty of their work compared to [8]. 2. Additional group of healthy mice treated with Silymarin is necessary. 3. The benefits of Silymarin application for affected liver could be explained by antioxidant and antifibrotic abilities of that, and this task is well-discussed. However, the authors indicated reduction of parasite burden (measured in ovo/gram liver tissue) in Silymarin-treated group. How could they explain this phenomenon? Does Silymarin prevent <i>S. mansoni</i> ovogenesis? Is it toxic for adult parasite? This task is very intriguing and should be discussed in more detail. 4. Conclusions are not consistent with the results. Thus, there were no studies of membrane permeability, LPO, GSH contents, so the authors could discuss these possibilities in Discussion section, but not put them into Conclusion. 5. The authors indicate in conclusion that "Kupffer and hepatic stellate cells (HSCs) are also activated by silymarin.". However, these cells are being prevented from activation by silymarin, as evidenced by the authors' own results (α-SMA decrease) and literature data. The authors should double-check the manuscript to avoid any misconductance. 6. Then, the authors state in conclusion that "Silymarin as a treatment for chronic hepatopathies will only be successful if done at the onset of the disease", but they started the treatment at the 12th week after the invasion – it is unlikely to be considered as onset of the disease. Moreover, the authors didn't check any other regimen of Silymarin application, so they shouldn't conclude about optimal one, at least according to obtained data. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some typos should be corrected (like ELIZA instead of ELISA) 2. Some phrases should be rearranged. For instance, "Treatment with Silymarin significantly enhanced liver histopathology" (p.16, paragraph 3) to "Treatment with Silymarin significantly improved liver morphology" 3. The same paragraph. The authors indicated that "Silymarin as well can activate Kupffer and hepatic stellate cells (HSCs) [26]". However, in cited work there was demonstrated that Silymarin can PREVENT HSC activation. 	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Halyna Kuznietsova
Department, University & Country	Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine