1. **Summary of the feedback received**

* The first reviewer
  + Overall very positive feedback: found the abstract clear and representative, introduction encompassing of all the necessary information, the methods detailed and complete, results accurate, discussion and conclusion clear
  + Only change they mentioned implementing was describing the classifier with more details
* Second reviewer
  + Overall: genera is inconsistent throughout the document (some in italics while others are not), supplemental figure referencing should be in order
  + Abstract: clear but could be more concise
  + Introduction: effectively presents necessary information
  + Methods: sufficient but could have more details about dataset, methodology and rationale for splitting data into low and high could be clearer, DESeq2 should include number of samples in each comparison group
  + Results: P-values should be included in Figure 1, Subfigures of each figure should be mentioned, Figures need more labels & annotations, Figure 4A and 4C should be cited in the text
  + Discussion: well written, could have an introductory sentence, DESeq paragraph needs figure references
  + Conclusion and References: good

1. **How we approached the feedback and implemented it into the revisions**
2. **If there was any feedback that was not implemented, why**