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Comments:

I have gone through the manuscript quickly as the time given to review this manuscript was ending soon. I wish to make following critical observations on this manuscript:

1. Under Abstract (Background, page 1 lines 39-41), aim of the study has been given as to evaluate "the amelioration of GPLs by WPL and investigated the possible role of WPL in regulating glucose metabolism". However, no where the findings have been correlated and explained with its significance in the changes in glucose metabolism GPLs after WPL treatment.

2. The reason for study of GPLs in selected specific animals model Atp4a-/- mice has been explained in the text at different places. Thus, can these findings be concluded as the mice strain specific or applicable to other animal models also ??

3. I fail to understand the correlation of the findings (page 2, lines 11-14) "Furthermore, WPL suppressed the expression of CDX2, MUC2, ki-67 PTEN and p53, as the levels of these proteins decreased significantly compared with the model group (P<0.05)" with the ameliorative effect of WPL against GPLs. I am not convinced with explanation given at page 12, lines 34-51.

4. The basis of selecting the doses (page 5, lines 25-30) "animals in the VIT group were administered 0.2 g/kg/d vitacoenzyme, and animals in the high-dose WPL group and low-dose WPL group were given 15 g/kg/d and 7.5 g/kg/d WPL, respectively" is not explained. Further, (page 5, lines 34-35) I fail to understand the meaning of "At the beginning of the 10th week, the treated mice were administered WPL or VIT by gastrogavage for 10 consecutive weeks,"

5. In Results (Page 8-11), unnecessary explanation/text has been added which are the duplication in Introduction and also in Discussion. The Discussion is very weakly explained. Although the techniques Immunohistochemistry Assay, TUNEL assay, Western blot analysis etc are good, scientifically, the manuscript has serious lacuna in its presentation and I do not support its publication in "BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine".
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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