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Reviewer's report:

This investigation posited that Weipiling ameliorates gastric precancerous lesions in Atp4a-/mice by inhibiting the expression of transporters and mTOR/HIF-1α pathways. The topic is interesting and the mouse model are employed to explain the effect of Weipiling. I recommend that this paper be accepted after several minor revisions. The details are listed below,

Major comments:

1. Background. Zeng et al (2018) simulated N-methyl-N’-nitro-N-nitrosoguanidine (MNNG)-induced GPL in male Sprague-Dawley rats. The authors may introduce the advantages of Atp4a-/mice model compared to other mouse models in GPL study.

2. Results. The manuscript have many separate figures which can be grouped by topics. For example, figure 2 and 3 can be grouped into a single figure.

3. In figures 2 and 3, the authors showed the representative images for H&E and AB-PAS staining, respectively. However, the authors may provide the quantitative data from 5 or 6 independent images to clarify the effect of Weipiling in figure 2 and 3.

4. In figure legends for figures 4~11, the authors do not include the sample sizes.

5. In figures 4~8, including western blot analysis would support the IHC data further.

6. Discussion. There was no mention of the limitations of this study. Also, mention how your results compare to other studies that were published recently.

Minor comments:

1. In the figures 2 and 3, images are missing the appropriate labels.

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.

Yes

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I have no competing interests.
I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal