

# Review of: "[Perspective] Glucolipotoxicity: A Novel Different Perspective on the Causes of Cancer"

Sun Wenshe<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Shandong First Medical University (SDFMU)

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript presents a novel perspective with the "glucolipotoxicity" hypothesis, emphasizing the significance of intracellular glycolipid metabolic disorder in tumor development. The authors have thoroughly discussed the Warburg effect and glucolipotoxicity, offering two distinct viewpoints. The structure of the paper is clear, with detailed content in each section and coherent argumentation. The paper compiles an extensive collection of relevant literature, providing robust evidence for its claims. It comprehensively summarizes and contrasts the theoretical models and mechanisms of the two hypotheses, suggesting that glucolipotoxicity may be the predominant factor, thus providing a fresh angle and expanding the research scope in this field.

However, as a review article, there are several areas where further improvements could be made:

1. In comparing the mechanisms of the Warburg effect and the glucolipotoxicity hypothesis, more detailed and clear illustrations could be provided to aid readers in understanding the differences between the two hypotheses.
2. A deeper analysis from both biological and medical perspectives could be conducted on the impact of the two hypotheses on the mechanisms of cancer onset and progression, highlighting the advantages of the authors' viewpoint. The main points of contention between the two hypotheses should be summarized, and the authors' personal insights offered.
3. The authors could discuss the potential applications of the glucolipotoxicity hypothesis in cancer prevention and treatment, such as the design of new therapeutic targets and personalized treatment strategies, underscoring its research value.
4. The reference list could be expanded to include more recent studies that support the authors' viewpoint, which would make the argumentation more substantial.
5. The structure of the article could benefit from an added conclusion section that summarizes the main differences between the two hypotheses and the novelty of the authors' perspective.
6. The language could be made smoother and more logically organized to help readers quickly grasp the main points.