

Editor's comments:

I read over the original and revised manuscript and also carefully checked the review reports. Overall, the current version has been substantially improved over the original one. However, I would like the authors to make some additional effort, carefully re-edit the entire manuscript, such that the paper may be more readable. Some specific points are here:

(1). The title does not well reflect the content covered in the text. The title appears to be too big and vague, letting one wander if the paper is dealing with AD as a whole, or syndromes, hypotheses, theories or therapies. Because the paper actually much focused on some pharmaceutical aspects of AD, I would suggest the authors to use another title (something like current and future strategies for AD therapy).

(2). Sentences and wordings are not clear or precise in many places. For instance, "deposition of GPR3 protein in the brain which augment toxic amyloid plaques" in the abstract. Did the authors really report deposition of GPR3 protein in AD brain (ref 75.)? This would mean that they see increased staining in sections; otherwise it is only an elevation of protein levels (by biochemical methods). Others such as: "may benefit AD"(pg 17. Line 491); "...in the brain should"(pg 17, line 503).

(3). Try to avoid no scholarly words or terms, such as "monster"(page 2, line 33) .

Author's feedback:

1. Yes, I concur with your suggestion, your suggested title aptly suited the write more than the initial title, so it is adopted and to be used.
2. Aptly, it is elevation or buildup of protein fragments and not deposition
"May benefit AD"- Corrected appropriately as seen in red color in the revised version 3
"...in the brain should"-Also corrected appropriately as will attenuate AD
3. "Monster"- Appropriately corrected as neurodegenerative disease.