



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_51032
Title of the Manuscript:	POWER-LAW BEHAVIOR OF ALTERNATIVE SPLICING OF EXONS IN HUMAN TRANSCRIPTOME
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The writing in this manuscript needs extensive revision, particularly with respect to grammar and word flow.</p> <p>I would also suggest more clear definitions of ECI, total ECO, in-ECI, and out-ECI.</p> <p>The paper may be a bit hard to follow for many "bench" "wet lab" molecular biologists, so clarity of explanation would be helpful.</p> <p>Perhaps a summary figure, for the Discussion/Conclusion, to help illustrate the major points/findings in graphical form, would be of benefit for some readers.</p> <p>Overall, the topic was interesting, methods reasonably sound, and conclusions have legitimacy. I would focus on those aspects of the paper that would enhance its meaningfulness for a broad audience of molecular and cell biologists and geneticists.</p>	<p>The text has been corrected as much as possible. English has been corrected by our colleagues at Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center (New York, USA).</p> <p>Additional clarifications were added to INTRODUCTION.</p> <p>Aim and objectives determine the content of the article. A complex task cannot be solved in a simple way.</p> <p>Summary figure was added to conclusion.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	