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**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This study presents structural models of the CagA protein, potential binding sites, and molecular docking simulation results with phenolic compounds. A comprehensive analysis of experimental data concludes that phenolic compounds in medicinal plants may form stable complexes with CagA, suggesting potential interference with interaction between CagA and cellular targets, thereby intervening in the gastric cell carcinogenesis process. Limitations: 1. Lack of experimental validation of interactions: The study relies solely on computational simulations to predict the interaction between phenolic compounds and CagA, lacking actual experimental data to validate the accuracy and reliability of these predictions. 2. Limited scope of results: Although the study indicates potential interactions between phenolic compounds and CagA, the actual effects in biological systems remain unclear due to the reliance solely on computational simulations, necessitating further experimental validation. 3. Limitations in sample selection: The study selects specific phenolic compounds for investigation, but whether these compounds represent all possible active ingredients in medicinal plants is unclear, potentially introducing sample selection bias. Suggestions for improvement:
1. Increase experimental validation: It is recommended that the authors conduct experimental validation based on computational simulations to confirm the existence of interactions between phenolic compounds and CagA and evaluate their biological effects in vivo. 2. Expand the sample range: Consider expanding the study sample range to include a wider variety of phenolic compounds from medicinal plants to obtain more comprehensive research results. 3. Further explore mechanisms: In addition to simply predicting interactions between phenolic compounds and CagA, further exploration of the effects of these compounds on CagA-mediated carcinogenesis mechanisms can reveal potential therapeutic mechanisms.
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