**Group Meeting Rubric—Figures and Captions**

*Instructions: Please provide comments on each figure in the space provided. Submit your comments as a group.*

Figure #1—Overall Structure. What are your comments about this figure? 1. Does the figure clearly show the overall structure with domains and/or motifs? 2. Is the structure in an orientation that allows you to view the domains of the protein? 3. Is the figure appropriately labeled and annotated? Is the color scheme pleasing to the eye and enhances the understanding of the information conveyed in the figure? 4. Do you have any suggestions to improve the figure?

For this question I will be commenting on figure 2, which I believe is group 8sby’s overall structure figure. The figure clearly shows the overall structure with domains differentiated by color (in 2a) and with motifs labeled (in 2b). I do think that 2b could be oriented better to show off the Rossman fold. The figure it appropriately labeled and annotated, and the color scheme is pleasing to the eye and clearly separates the domains. Aside from adjusting the positioning of 2b to highlight the Rossman fold, I have no suggestions.

Figure #2—Homologs. What are your comments about this figure? 1. Does this figure show the overall domain structure of the structurally aligned homologs? 2. Is the identification of each homolog clear? 3. Did the authors use appropriate colors and style? 4. Do you have any suggestions to improve the figure?

For this question I will be commenting on figure 3. This figure shows the overall domain structure of the aligned homologs. The identification of each homolog is made clear by their color coding. The authors used the appropriate color and style. No suggestions for improvement.

Figure #3—Ligand Interactions. What are your comments about this figure? 1. Do the non-covalent interactions (hydrogen-bonding, ionic, etc.) make chemical sense? 2. Do the authors show the correct coordination of metal ions and H2O molecules? 3. Is the color scheme consistent with other figures. 4. Do you have any suggestions for improving the figure?

For this question I will be talking about figure 4. The non-covalent interactions make chemical sense. There are no metal ions or H2O molecules included int eh figure. The stick renderings’ coloring is consistent with other figures. No suggestions for improving the figure.

Figure #4—Wildcard. What are your comments about this figure? 1. Does the figure clearly provide the information the authors are trying to convey? 2. If the authors are showing interactions, are they clearly labeled.? 3. Are any previously unintroduced proteins/ligands/compounds clearly labeled?

4. Do you have any suggestions for improving the figure?

In this question I will be discussing figures 1 and 5. The figure clearly provides the information the authors are trying to convey. The interactions are clearly labeled by the residues they are occurring between (figure 5) and the between arrow-puching mechanism steps (figure 1). Previously unintroduced proteins and ligands are clearly labeled in 1 and 5b/c. Only suggestion I would have would be to keep the coloring consistent between figures 4 and 5 for clarity.

Figure Captions Text. What are your comments about the text? 1. Does the figure have a short descriptive title? 2. Does the text clearly explain the color scheme and identity of all proteins, ligands, etc., in the figure? 3. Do you have any suggestions to improve the text?

Each figure has an appropriate short descriptive title. The text clearly explains the color scheme and identity of all proteins and ligands. No suggestions to improve the text.