

Review of: "Cryo-EM of the yeast VO complex reveals distinct binding sites for macrolide V-ATPase inhibitors"

Manuel Aureliano¹

¹ Universidade do Algarve

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

The author's review entitled "Cryo-EM of the yeast VO complex reveals distinct binding sites for macrolide V-ATPase Inhibitors" is very interesting and well written.

I would recommend the suggestions described below:

1. The title should be specific, short and concise. That would favor future citations to the paper. What is really new in the paper?
2. Abstract should be quantitative as possible for rapid comparison with others studies, referring for instance to IC50 values. After reading the paper some data information is missing in the abs. The abs should and/or could be, a least in part, a mirror of the paper results and not about 50% a kind of intro, aims or approaches.
3. At the end of the intro, it also not totally clear, at least in part, what is the main message and relevant points of the review that should be emphasize at this stage. What is really timely and new in the review?
4. I would like to make the following suggestion: a figure or scheme with the chronology or a timeline of the major events in the field, for instance, for the first studies on V-ATPases using this inhibitors and/or pharmaceutical applications, would be interesting and usual for a better understanding of the paper. Moreover, this timeline will also reflect the understanding of the authors about these events. This personal view timeline will be interesting and also pedagogical for the others researchers and professors in the field as well as also for medical scientists.
5. A conclusion section is eventually missing. A conclusion should resume partial and then global conclusions and also with concerns and perspectives for future research.