Reviewer 1

Helminth interactions with bacteria in the host gut are essential for its immunomodulatory effect

I congratulate the authors on the quality of the work developed, a well-designed investigation, structured methodology, robust bibliographic research and correct scientific writing. Just a few points, I would like to comment.

** Many thanks to the reviewer for this very positive evaluation of our manuscript and work. We appreciate it a lot.*

I - Structure

1. It is suggested a brief review regarding the spacings between the number of citations placed in parentheses, to maintain the coherence of the text.

** revised*

2. Observe the alignment of the text, particularly in the acknowledge, funding and author contribution.

** revised*

3. Line 246 (Figure 2).

** revised*

II - General Considerations

1. There is an excessive reference to previously published works (e.g., Material and Methods - line 166 and 176) that does not particularly value the writing and the article.

** revised*

2. Figure 1 shows only text, without any graphic or figure, but requires also formatting and has unnecessary references - such as for more information see Material and Methods.

** apologies, it happened probably because of the very high resolution of the original figure 1. Now, the figure was adjusted according to the guidelines.*

3. Histology results (line 333) – AC (colonized or **antibiotic**?)

** corrected*

III – Discussion

1. The first paragraph excessively repeats the experimental design methodology, and is therefore considered capable of being summarized.

** revised*

2. Discussion about the effect of protection of *H. diminuta* on intestinal inflammation (line 453) is based on previous studies by the authors. The justification of the contradiction of results (TNFα) is supported in this study by the stress, but deserved a little more deepening. Comparison with other scientific papers could enrich the discussion.

** agree with the reviewer. We supported the statement that stress can affect TNFα using the relevant reference (for details see this in discussion). However, we prefer not to go too deep in this part of discussion in order to avoid over-interpretation.*

IV – Conclusion

1. The conclusion is considered the least achieved chapter of the article (regardless of its quality). It introduces or reinforces concepts that should be analysed in the discussion (618-620; 626-628), and not valuing in a synthetic way the results, their scientific interest and the opening (or confirmation) of new hypotheses that this study allowed.

** agree with the reviewer. The conclusion was revised, and it is built up on the achieved results in our study. The part was transferred to the discussion according to suggestion of the reviewer (for details see the last two paragraphs of discussion and conclusion).*

In general, very interesting scientific paper and of interest to the Academy, being valued by small corrections or suggestions acceptance.

** thank you!*