## nature portfolio

## Peer Review File



**Open Access** This file is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to

the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. In the cases where the authors are anonymous, such as is the case for the reports of anonymous peer reviewers, author attribution should be to 'Anonymous Referee' followed by a clear attribution to the source work. The images or other third party material in this file are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit <a href="http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/">http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/</a>.

Editorial Note: This manuscript has been previously reviewed at another journal that is not operating a transparent peer review scheme. This document only contains reviewer comments and rebuttal letters for versions considered at *Nature Communications*.

## Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer #1:

Remarks to the Author:

I thank the authors for their very thorough rebuttal.

Im happy with the revised version of the manuscript and the additional clarifications.

It was helpful to see that the authors have performed a normality test (one for low samples number). The further softening and clarifications to the text are also helpful.

## **REVIEWERS' COMMENTS**

Reviewer #1 (Remarks to the Author):

I thank the authors for their very thorough rebuttal.

*Im happy with the revised version of the manuscript and the additional clarifications.* 

It was helpful to see that the authors have performed a normality test (one for low samples number). The further softening and clarifications to the text are also helpful.

A: Many thanks for the positive comments, it is great to see that the reviewer is now pleased with our revised manuscript.