Critically reading scientific papers

Meredith C. Schuman

The following are guidelines to effectively read a scientific paper.

(1) Summarize briefly what the authors claim. See also point (3).

Read the title and abstract. Summarize the claims in your own words or paste in the key sentences as a citation if they are very clear to you, for reference.

The authors discuss how plant metabolites can be used to describe a kind of functional trait framework similar to physiological or morphological traits. Instead of relying on just the metabolites alone, the authors looked at the chemical properties of the metabolites to find meaningful overlaps and strategies across species and plant species.
Their central claim was that the leaf metabolome varies across two major axes: Chemical defense axis and a leaf longevity axis. They argued that these axes are largely independent of normal functional plant traits.

(2) What are the authors' hypotheses (or questions), tests (or ways they attempt to answer the questions), and conclusions? Are these supported? See also point (3).

Read the last paragraph of the introduction; methods & results; first & last paragraphs of the discussion.

> ➔ Pay special attention to **figures** and **tables**, both in the **main** and in the **supplementary**! Are these clear? Does their organization make sense to you? What is the take-home message of each one?

The study tests two hypotheses:

- Metabolic traits align with classical functional traits like validating normal existing leaf function
- Metabolic traits contribute new biological information compared to classical information -> Different axes

They phrased this as two competing hypotheses namely the "Colinearity hypothesis", metabolic traits align with classical traits and the "Orthogonality hypothesis", metabolic traits describe new, independent axes of plant strategies.
They tested this using 457 tropical and 339 temperate species using untargeted LC-MS metabolomics and got 4292 annotated metabolites.
They reduce chemistry from 21 chemical descriptors into 5 distinct metabolic functional traits using correlation clustering and PCA to show that these traits capture the most variation. PCA was done to see if plants cluster along major metabolic "gradients". The PCA was compared with standard functional traits to tests.
Figure 1 shows that many chemical descriptors were reduced into five interpretable chemical traits -> clear structure.

Figure 3 shows that species distribute along the two main metabolic axes, representing chemical defense and leaf longevity. This shows strong evidence that metabolism follows structured ecological strategies, rather than being random chemical fluctuations
Figure 4 shows a correlation matrix among metabolic and functional traits supporting the orthogonality hypothesis.
The authors' concluded that metabolic traits form two major leaf metabolite axes of leaf specialization and that these axes are independent from classical functional leaf traits. This shows that metabolomics does not only validate existing trait frameworks but also expands them by revealing new hidden axes or dimensions of plant form and strategies.

➔ Summarize the authors' line of argument in your own words and note whether you think their arguments are supported, and why or why not (or if you can't judge because something is unclear).

Overall, the data and analysis strongly supports the authors hypothesis. The metabolic axes seem reproducible across both species and the independence from classical traits is shown in the PCA. The consistency across the datasets support the authors conclusion that metabolic traits capture new biological structure. The results support the orthogonal hypothesis rather than the collinearity hypothesis

(3) Note anything you think is either especially well done, interesting, or unclear.

Do this while addressing points (1) and (2) above and then reading the rest of the paper. Just make free notes here. You can sort them later if needed.

Figures are well structured and nicely presented
Figure 1 is rather complex and showing the molecules is a bit confusing and maybe could've been described rather than showing large molecules.
Figure 2 shows a nice PCA and is analysed in Figure 3 which makes it very understandable
The hypotheses are easy enough to understand and are thoroughly discussed in the paper
The discussion is relatively short but has all necessary information to create a good closing.

(4) Summarize your thoughts about and understanding of the paper.

The following very useful suggestions come from the eLife assessment model.

Answer these questions: for whom is this study of interest? What are the authors' aims? What did they do (measure/observe/analyze) in what system? How well does the evidence support the conclusions?

Example: "This **landmark** study provides a comprehensive morphological and molecular description of the majority of documented neuronal cell types in the mouse cortex. This provides an extraordinary resource that will be invaluable to the whole neuroscience community. The methodology for combining expansion microscopy with spatially resolved transcriptomics across tissues is **exceptional** and establishes a new standard in the field."

Use standardized terminology

For breadth of interest (and potential breadth of impact):

Landmark: findings with profound implications that are expected to have widespread influence
Fundamental: findings that substantially advance our understanding of major research questions
Important: findings that have theoretical or practical implications beyond a single subfield
Valuable: findings that have theoretical or practical implications for a subfield
Useful: findings that have focused importance and scope

For strength of support:

Exceptional: exemplary use of existing approaches that establish new standards for a field
Compelling: evidence that features methods, data and analyses more rigorous than the current state of the art
Convincing: appropriate and validated methodology in line with current state-of-the-art
Solid: methods, data and analyses broadly support the claims with only minor weaknesses
Incomplete: main claims are only partially supported
Inadequate: methods, data and analyses do not support the primary claims

The study is for researchers in the field of plant ecology, functional trait ecology, metabolomics and evolutionary biology especially those trying to understand the different axes and trait frameworks in plants. The authors tried to find out whether leaf metabolic traits simply reflect classical functional traits or whether they provide new independent dimensions of plant strategy. To analyse this, they used a structured approach to look at the leaf metabolome of 457 tropical and 339 temperate species using untargeted LC-MS and reduced chemistry into 5 interpretable metabolic traits which they then compared to classical functional traits. Overall this paper can be considered important in breadth of interest because it extends functional trait theory beyond simple morphology and physiology by introducing the metabolome. The evidence is convincing as the analyses are extensive and the results were replicable across independent systems. In summary, the paper provides a solid and well supported case that metabolism represents a distinct biologically meaningful layer of functional plant traits rather than being random chemical fluctuations.