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Peer Review Summary

The title of the Gant Proposal was lack luster. I know Grant Proposals aren’t supposed to be frilly, but I would like to be captivated by the title. The introduction needed more background information on E.coli and other experiments involving E.coli. I think that the writers could have incorporated more of the past experiments and how the experiments motivated them to do this research. There is some mention of motivation in the last sentence, “Knowing how E. Coli communicate can give humans an advantage to fixing common health issues. One for instance, is how E. Coli is responsible for >90% of UTIs (5)”, but there should definitely more to their motivation. I would have liked to see how their research would impact society or why this research is important. I think that the Introduction is kind of lacking in vital information. They address all the main points, but don’t get to the heart of their motivation or background.

The study system is pretty well phrased. I think there is enough information mentioned. I would like to see the citations expanded slightly more. I don’t think it’s too short, but it is kind of short. There could be more explanation on how other experiments influenced their study systems. I would recommend going more into detail on the processes of E.coli communication. There are only two sentences about the communication processes on E. coli, but there could be more of a breakdown on the processes.

The experiment portion is also lacking in explanation. There is some mention on testing a hypothesis “We will test this hypothesis by inhibiting the AI-2 dependent signaling pathway with repressors LsrR and LsrK, proline residue insertion, a D*lsrK* and D*lsrR*D*luxS* mutation, and inhibiting the synthases that produce autoinducers (9-12)” but not really any other mention about what they expect their results would be. I think they could have gone through more of an explanation on how their experiment related to other experiments’ outcomes were. There is a clear explanation on what the procedures are, but I would like to see how they formulated these experiments. I’m not sure if a Grant Proposal needs to be thorough but I think it’s better to be over explained than under explained. It’s good they explained the alternative hypothesis to their hypothesis. Overall, I think the experiment portion is pretty thought out, but I would like more explanation. I would also like to see outcomes from other experiments and citations. My overall gripe is that there should be more explanation to why this research is so important, and why other things can arise from doing this experiment.

The Grant Proposal is not terrible, but it need more work. Overall it seems rushed. I would have definitely spent more time on the Grant Proposal.