Gitgud Project Proposal Review Summary

The authors addressed the environment and significance well in the proposal. There was a small error between exhibiting the difference between resistance and susceptibility, however, it was understood why the choice was made not to dwell on the topic.

The authors did not identify the innovative aspect well in the proposal. This was evident at the end of the report where it is stated, “Though we are working with a eukaryote, its small, efficient genome should reduce the memory and time required to run each process compared to other eukaryotic data sets” it leave the reader with an unclear path of what exactly it wanted as a result or outcome of this experiment e.g. what genes are being looked for.

Although, the investigator part was well written we believe that since there are different sample being ran, the group should explore the option of going through the pipeline completely, once together and then being able to split up. This would help decrease the chance of bias or mistakes being made, ensuring the pipeline and code works well. This will also be a great learning aspect for all group members. The “conflict resolution” section was vague and should rethink the   
“voting” system because of the even amount of members and also to explain what will happen if a member does not complete work in a timely manner. Lastly, the reviewers appreciated the end of the paper where the authors explained how they learned from their previous projects, “In our last project, our group ran into issues troubleshooting efficiently during long walltime runs; by choosing efficient packages this time, we hope to progress through the analytical portion of our pipeline quickly so more time can be devoted to interpreting results”.

The approach of the proposal was poorly executed, there was no explanation of possible errors being made and how they could possibly fix them by using another software. As well as no explanation of previous or current knowledge of how the steps being done are used. The reviewers believe this could be improved by simply explaining each step of the pipeline individually and why it is being used. Lastly, there was not much discussion of full analysis of what genes are wanting to be viewed. Moreover, the figure of the pipeline was well explained and drawn out.

All of this being said, the proposal had a clear path on the biological significance of what they wanted to accomplish by “Although DNA viruses may be a promising biological control mechanism to mitigate the increasing ecological instability imposed by harmful algal blooms, concentrated treatment of blooms could increase the rate of viral resistance development within the target populations”.