Replicative Lifespan Resetting and Meiosis

By Jingxun Chen

Reviewed by Michael Plasmeier

The author hopes to evaluate the contribution of individual target genes of Ndt80 on resettingmis-segregation errors during meiosis to lead to the self-renewal of cells during meiosis every generation. The author hopes to carry out the research at MIT's Amon Lab.

The author has requested a proper amount of funding. The author [She] has provided a sufficient explanation of what is to be researched as well as a very details explanation as to how the research will be performed. However the author has not provided sufficient evidence to support the proposed timeframe of the project. A more detailed timeframe of work to be completed would strengthen the proposal. Furthermore, the significance of the research has not been provided. Although this category does not usually provide a great deal of original insight, it is helpful to know what the author believes the significance of their work is. *[good point]*

The table is unreadable in the submitted format. The author should submit future documents in a format which ensures document fidelity between computers.Finally, the proposal should be reviewed by a subject-manner aspect as this reviewer is unable to comment on much of the proposal. This reviewer believes that this proposal is very strong and that it should be recommended for funding while [if] the author submits a research timeline and provides an outline of research goals.

Recommended for funding

[Handwritten comments:]

Your review is concise, focused, and well structured. You give clear justification for your recommendation for funding, while still noting some flaws in the proposal.

Even in a document like this, it's important to pay attention to the quality and fluency of your prose. Five consecutive sentences that begin with the subject "the author" creates a "choppiness" that detracts from the piece. Also, you need to proofread more carefully.

Grade: A-