

Review of: "Somatostatin and the pathophysiology of Alzheimer's disease"

Thomas Gabriel Schreiner¹

¹ University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iasi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

To whom it may concern,

Thank you for inviting me to review the manuscript entitled "Somatostatin and the pathophysiology of Alzheimer's disease". The author makes a very interesting hypothesis related to one hormone that might be of great interest in the pathophysiology of AD. The review was interesting to read, however, I want to highlight some aspects that can be improved:

1. Please try to find more recent references (ideally from the last 5 years) and change the older ones. Some potential changes: the first paragraph in the introduction,
2. All abbreviations should be explained the first time they appear in the abstract and/or in the text.
3. Second paragraph in the introduction: you enumerate a lot of hypotheses for AD. Although they were first stated long ago (1976, 1991, ...), many of them suffered changed and/or were reconsidered. This is an important thing that you could mention.
4. Third paragraph in the introduction: "our aim...". As far as I see, there is only one author. I suggest you replace "our" with "the author" here and anywhere else in the manuscript. Same for "we will cover".
5. Please be consistent with the abbreviations: use A β , not Ab!
6. The hypothesis is based extensively on the SST-amyloid crosstalk. However, as you have stated in the introduction, there are several other hypotheses for AD onset and progression (neuroinflammation, oxidative stress, iron imbalance). It could also be interesting to detail a few paragraphs on these topics.
7. The article lacks a final conclusion. Maybe a figure that summarizes the whole pathophysiological mechanism would be of interest to the reader to have a general overview of your theory.