

A. Reviewer's summary of the key findings

The reviewer summarizes the key findings of the paper as they perceive them and places the manuscript in the context of the state-of-the-art of the field. This section includes a brief summary of the key scientific questions and methodologies used by the authors.

B. The big picture

1. Do the results represent a significant advancement in the field of study?
2. Are the findings novel?
3. What are some key strengths and weaknesses of the study?
4. Are the author's conclusions consistent with the data?
5. How conservative are the author's conclusions?
6. ...

C. Major Issues

1. Are the data clearly presented?
2. Are gene names, protein names, etc., written according to field-specific conventions?
3. Does the text correspond with the figures and tables?
4. Are any obvious control experiments absent?
5. Are additional experiments required to support the conclusions?
6. Is the working model consistent with the results?
7. ...

D. Minor Issues

1. Are abbreviations and acronyms used correctly?
2. Are field-specific terms used correctly?
3. Is the abstract readable and understandable by non-experts?
4. Is the manuscript formatted appropriately for the target journal?
5. ...

E. Journal Selection and Impact

Are the reviewer-perceived impact of the manuscript and the impact factor of the target journal consistent? Is the chosen format, e.g., Letter, Report, etc., appropriate?

F. Further Comments

1. Other comments on the construction of the manuscript.
2. Ideas for increasing the perceived impact.
3. ...