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Author’s response to reviews:

Editorial comments:

In the (previous) decision letter, the following editorial concerns were raised:

1.) In keeping with our formatting guidelines for Review articles (https://bmcmedicine.biomedcentral.com/submission-guidelines/preparing-your-manuscript/reviews), the Abstract should be structured so that it has 3 sections: background, main body, and short conclusion. Also, please minimise the use of abbreviations.

Response: as requested, the abstract is now divided into three sections: background, review and conclusion.

2.) Likewise, the main text should be structured in the same way (though you can include subheadings): a background, main body, and (final) conclusions. For this, I suggest changing the '1. Introduction' heading to 'Background', delineating this from the main body by including a second heading (at the moment it is unclear where the introduction ends and the main body begins; does it start with 'Role of ApoE'?), change subheadings 2.10 and 3.8 to 'Summary' (rather than 'Conclusions'), and change '4. Epilogue' to 'Conclusions' (this should be the third main heading).

Response: as requested, the subtitles of the main text were changed in response to your suggestions, we now have background instead of introduction, summary instead of conclusion and instead of epilogue. Regarding the main body, it is divided into two parts: Review of suggested apoE-driven mechanisms and Review of the apoE4-targeted therapeutic approaches. The headings have now been changed to stress this division including the wording of the heading and underlying them.

Thank you very much for your consideration
Sincerely