**Templeton Grant Proposal – Academic Reviewer Feedback**

I have carefully reviewed your submitted proposal for a Templeton Genetics grant, and have revised the grammar and phrasing while keeping your intended meaning intact. As I have a background in the field of aging research, I have several thoughts and questions about the grant that may help you maximize your chances of attaining funding. My thoughts are summarized in the following points:

1. Overall the goal of this grant proposal is to ensure that it can be readily interpreted by someone without a specific scientific background in this field. As such, I have attempted to simplify the language where possible. However, in some cases it is not possible to fully remove certain technical terms (methylation, biomarker, epigenetics/epiloci) that the average person might need to Google. Even so, having reviewed some of the other funded projects in the Genetics section of the Templeton website, I believe this to be perfectly acceptable.
2. I am not sure if there is a specific need to list the epigenetic profiling technologies you will use. I have left them in the current draft, but if you are concerned about making the application more accessible you may consider removing them and using more general terms.
3. You alluded to three Aims in your project summary which I have explicitly listed in the revised draft. The third of these aims (referring to mode of inheritance) would benefit from a bit more explanatory text, perhaps referring to intergenerational benefits. This would allow it to align more with the brief from the Templeton organization.
4. I think the section on why your organization is well-positioned to be successful would benefit from a bit of restructuring to more generally discuss your access to state-of-the art technologies (rather than splitting this across multiple points).
5. For your “Executive Summary” section, I think it would be appropriate to delete the middle paragraph in order to reach the target character count.
6. You alternate between the terms “ELLIs” and “centenarians”. I have standardized this to ELLIs, because it lowers the character count, but please make sure this is correct.
7. For Aim 3c, more explanation is likely necessary regarding what you are going to do with the offspring of ELLI to assess the heritability of these epigenetic patterns.
8. Please define the age groups in your study (ELLIs and elderly groups).
9. I’m not sure I fully understand the grouping/treatment strategy for your mouse experiments. While I know this is not an in-depth grant proposal, I think some additional clarification here would be beneficial.
10. I have added many comments in the text with my thoughts and suggestions on smaller points.
11. In your “Statement of Significance” section, some additional discussion of the current challenges in the field could help clarify the potential impact of your project. The description in the current draft provides a general overview, but might be stronger by emphasizing the unmet medical need associated with unhealthy aging or by describing some specific benefits of HBOT.
12. For these types of grants, it is often good to directly restate some of the phrases from the website of the funding body. As such, it might be worth mentioning that you are studying “fundamental epigenetic mechanisms” and mentioning “inter-generational transmittance” in your project.

I am happy to provide further edits to your grant proposal as you prepare it for submission, and look forward to additional updates on your research progress.

Best Regards,

Your Editor