

## Information for Referees of *Science Signaling* Research Articles and Research Resources

*Science Signaling* seeks to publish high-impact research pertaining to the general area of cell signaling and regulatory biology. Papers are expected to present a major research finding of broad significance. They should substantially advance our understanding of the mechanisms underlying cellular or organismal responses to external or internal cues, and refine current views of the molecular signaling processes.

**Research Articles** should substantially refine our current understanding of important cellular or organismal regulatory events and should be of broad interest to scientists engaged in the general area of cellular regulation.

**Research Resources** may describe nonhypothesis-driven research, including the presentation of new validated tools or techniques or validated databases or data sets relevant to cellular regulation. Adequate validation of the method or data is essential and, if appropriate, manuscript should include analysis of the collated data that could not have been performed on individual or smaller data sets.

Your review should include a recommended action, an overall evaluation, a rating of the quality of the study, a rating of the impact of the study, an indication of the deficiencies of the paper, an evaluation of the necessity of any requested experiments, and detailed comments for the authors. You may also provide confidential comments for the editors. Detailed instructions are included with the manuscript PDF.

**Security:** Please inform us if you have concerns that release of this paper may pose a danger to public health, safety, or security. Such concerns will be brought to the attention of the Chief Scientific Editor for further evaluation.

**Conflict of interest:** If you cannot judge this paper impartially, please notify us immediately. If you have any financial or professional affiliations that may be perceived as a conflict of interest in reviewing the manuscript, describe these as indicated on our online review form.

**Confidentiality:** We expect reviewers to protect the confidentiality of the material presented. Please ensure that the enclosed manuscript is not disseminated or exploited. If you find it necessary to discuss this submission with a colleague, please specify the particulars in a letter to the editor. Our review process is confidential; we do not disclose the identity of our reviewers or any confidential material they have provided to us.

### Returning your review:

Please return your review through the *Science* Journals Manuscript Submission and Information Portal: <https://cts.sciencemag.org>. If absolutely necessary, we can also receive reviews by e-mail at [scisignalreview@aaas.org](mailto:scisignalreview@aaas.org). Include the manuscript ID number in the subject line of your E-mail. The ID number is found in the filename of the PDF of the manuscript that you are reviewing.

## STRUCTURED REVIEW

### Include the following information in your review:

- 1) **Rate the quality of the study, using the terms below, in your comments to the editor**
  - **Excellent:** exceptional research design, conclusions are fully supported by the data
  - **High:** strong research design, minimal additional experiments needed to support the conclusions
  - **Average:** strong experimental design, some additional experiments or controls needed to support the conclusions
  - **Fair:** uneven quality in experimental design, many additional experiments or controls needed
  - **Poor:** serious weaknesses in experimental design; conclusions are not adequately supported by the data
- 2) **Rate the impact of the study, using the terms below, in your comments to the editor**
  - **Very high:** Major advance with impact in several fields
  - **High:** Potential to advance one or more fields
  - **Average:** Important advance for a defined field
  - **Low:** Limited advance over previous studies or advance limited by flaws
- 3) **Indicate if any of the following deficiencies are present and provide details in the comments to the authors:**
  - Lacks mechanism
  - Conclusions not supported by the data
  - Missing or inappropriate quantification and statistical analysis
  - Too descriptive or phenomenological
  - Not within journal scope
  - Inappropriate or missing references
- 4) **Indicate if the manuscript requires any of the following and provide details in the comments to the authors:**
  - Additional controls
  - Additional experiments
  - Quantification and statistical analysis
  - Revision for language usage or clarity of presentation
  - Additional references

In your detailed comments for the authors, clearly explain your selections to questions to 3-4 above. Also, if specific experiments are proposed, indicate if these experiments fundamentally change the conclusions of the study and briefly explain why.

In your specific comments to the editors, include responses to questions 1 and 2 above.

### Indicate your recommended action for the paper using the checkboxes on the reviewer site:

- **Publish without delay** (Accept)
- **Publish with minor revision** (Accept pending minor revision, no additional experiments or re-review necessary)
- **Needs re-review after revisions** (additional experiments or rewriting needed, re-review is necessary)
- **Not highest priority** (Technically sound, but not exciting or innovative)
- **Reject**

### Indicate your overall rating of the paper using the checkboxes on the reviewer site:

- **Excellent and exciting** (study is technically sound, appropriate for the journal, includes new findings of broad interest or describes innovative approaches)
- **Above average** (study is technically sound, appropriate for the journal, includes new findings or significantly extends previous studies, uses relatively new approaches)
- **Too specialized** (study is too narrow or inappropriate for the journal's focus)
- **Mediocre or poor** (study has weakness in design, is missing essential controls, or conclusions are not adequately supported by the data)