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Letter to the editor:

Dear editor,

In this document is my revised Microreview manuscript. To address the concerns and comments raised by the 3 reviewers, reading my revision requested, here is a list of the critiques I implemented into my manuscript in hopes to make this manuscript eligible for publication.

Sincerely,

Krystal Huffaker

Reviewer 1- The first reviewer was simple. I know my paper needs fixing, they just weren’t extremely detailed when reading the paper. Here are the tips I implemented into my paper:

-Changed the spacing to 1.0

-Added more content to be certain to have the word count required.

-Left in text citations due to this being a manuscript and not an actual textbook

Reviewer 2-This reviewer makes me believe that maybe my paper is well thought out and that I am being more critical on myself than I should be. Here are the tips I implemented into my paper:

-Broke up Paragraph 1 in the Other environmental factors to two sentences.

-explained endocytosis for audience, but intracellular because I believe that term is self-explanatory.

Reviewer 3- This reviewer provided me a source of adding more content to the manuscript. I was having a hard time deciding what to expand on and they helped point what needed more information. Here are the tips I implemented into my paper:

-Elaborated in importance of awareness

-reduced sentence that seemed side tracking and kept them on topic.