

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE REVIEWERS

Below, we show the format of the reviewer report and provide some information and questions for you to bear in mind.

Current overall ratings for the paper:

- High priority
- Medium Priority
- Low priority

Recommendations:

- Accept - No More Revisions Required
- Revise - Only Rewriting and/or Language-Polishing Required
- Revise - Additional Experiments Required
- Reject - Poor Experimental Design
- Reject - Major Additional Experiments and/or Rewriting Required
- Reject - Generally Poor Quality

Comments to the Editor:

- Can the paper be accepted at this stage?
- Should it be rejected?
- Is there evidence of any potential scientific misconduct?
- Do you as a referee have any conflicts of interest?
- Did any of your colleagues help with the review?

Comments to the Author:

- Does the paper comply with the scope of the journal as defined in the journal website?
- Does the title accurately describe the contents?
- Does the Abstract accurately summarise the findings?
- Are the findings scientifically sound?
- Are the experiments valid?
- What additional experiments are essential to make the paper suitable for publication in this journal?
- Should supplementary data or methods be provided by the authors?
- Does the Introduction give adequate background to understand the results and does it clearly state the objectives of the study?
- Are the methods appropriate and are they described in sufficient detail so that the methodology can be replicated?
- Is the statistical analysis complete and appropriate?
- Are the results logically presented and adequately described?
- Are the conclusions warranted on the basis of the experiments described?
- Are the limitations of the conclusions described, alternative hypotheses discussed and the implications for future studies included?
- Has the appropriate literature been cited and discussed adequately?
- Can the language, structure or presentation be improved so that the paper can be better understood?