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The manuscript must describe a technically sound piece of scientific research with data that supports the conclusions. Experiments must have been conducted rigorously, with appropriate controls, replication, and sample sizes. The conclusions must be drawn appropriately based on the data presented.  
  
1. Is the manuscript technically sound?

Reviewer: (Y/N)  
Please explain:

2. Do the data support the conclusions?  
  
Reviewer: (Y/N)  
Please explain:

3. Has the statistical analysis been performed appropriately and rigorously?  
  
Reviewer: (Y/N)  
Please explain.

4. Will the study in its current form make a significant impact in the field? Are the findings largely descriptive? Are the findings incremental?

Do the findings/results presented in the manuscript contribute to a significant progression in the field in terms of a new mechanism or pathway? Does it provide new insight into a previously studied mechanism or pathway? Is the study largely descriptive in nature, with little attention given to physiological relevance?   
  
Reviewer: (Y/N)  
Please explain for each applicable question.  
5. Is the manuscript presented in an intelligible fashion and written in standard English?  
  
The language in submitted articles must be clear, correct, and unambiguous. Any typographical or grammatical errors should be corrected at revision, so please note any specific errors below.  
  
Reviewer: (Y/N)  
Please explain and provide corrections (take as much space as need it).

6. Does the paper cover all necessary references?   
  
Please offer any additional comments here regarding more literature reading (if any necessary).  
Reviewer:

7. Additional Comments to the Author (optional)  
  
Please offer any additional comments here, including concerns about research or publication ethics.  
  
Reviewer: