

Peer Review

Review of: "The Concept of ME/CFS"

Noé López-Amador¹

1. Universidad Veracruzana, Mexico

It is difficult to define what we do not know very well, and in ME/CFS, there is too much to learn. The connection between stressors and neuroendocrine signaling is clear, as many papers report changes in neuroendocrine function and even brain changes. But etiology is still a mystery because there are too many factors involved in the pathophysiology of what we have accepted to call CFS, ME, or even SEID. This commentary is prolific in terms of the complexity of conceptualizing something we do not know very well, but it will benefit from trying to join all the pieces of the disperse evidence about the physiology of this disease. Mentioning briefly which potential biomarkers can help not only to understand the origin of the disease but to ascertain diagnostic precision, since only clinical criteria are used to diagnose ME/CFS/SEID. I will suggest adding to this commentary what has been found in terms of functional and organic changes in patients with a presumption of CFS/ME/SEID. This could be helpful to understand the etiology, pathophysiology, and diagnosis of CFS. There are interesting data in the literature to enrich and enhance the theoretical approach of this valued commentary.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.