



Information for Reviewers of Reports

SCIENCE'S MISSION: *Science* seeks to publish those papers that are most influential in their fields and that will significantly advance scientific understanding. Selected papers should present novel and broadly important data, syntheses, or concepts. They should merit the recognition by the scientific community and general public provided by publication in *Science*, beyond that provided by specialty journals.

CRITERIA FOR JUDGMENT

Reports should present a major, novel, and original research result that is of strong interdisciplinary interest or unusual interest to the specialist.

Overall Recommendation: On the basis of the mission statement above, recommend in your review whether the paper should be published in *Science* and provide a more detailed critique based on the following:

Technical Rigor: Evaluate whether, or to what extent, the data and methods substantiate the conclusions and interpretations. If appropriate, indicate what additional data and information are needed to validate the conclusions or support the interpretations.

Novelty: Indicate in your review if the conclusions are novel or are too similar to work already published.

Supporting Online Material. Supporting online material includes methods, text or data that is of interest only to the specialist, but that is still necessary for the integrity and excellence of the paper. It must be directly related to the conclusions of the print paper. We welcome suggestions for deletions of supporting online material or items that should be moved to supporting online material.

Security: We ask reviewers to inform us if they have concerns that release of this paper may pose a danger to public health, safety, or security. Such concerns will be brought to the attention of the Editor-in-Chief for further evaluation.

Length. Reports should be about 3 printed pages (2000 to 2500 words and up to four figures). Additional supporting material can be included online.

The final selection is based on relative quality of papers rather than absolute merit and is constrained by available space in Science and our commitment to balance subject matter.

Conflict of Interest: If you cannot judge this paper impartially, please notify us immediately. If you have any financial or professional affiliations that may be perceived as a conflict of interest in reviewing the manuscript, please describe those in your confidential comments.

Confidentiality: We expect reviewers to protect the confidentiality of the manuscript and ensure that it is not disseminated or exploited. Please destroy your copy of the manuscript when you are done. Only discuss the paper with a colleague with permission from the editor. We do not disclose the identity of our reviewers.

Returning your review: Please return your review using our WWW form at <http://www.submit2science.org/mtsreferee>. Use the user name and password sent to you by the editor to login to the site. We recommend that you type your review in a separate word processor and paste it into the review form; any typing on the www form will be lost after the 90-minute session times out. We can also receive reviews by email to science_reviews@aaas.org or by FAX to 202-408-1256.

Should this manuscript be accompanied by a Perspective?

Perspectives are short commentaries on current research published in *Science* or elsewhere. If you feel that this work deserves such a discussion for a wider audience, please include a note to the editor. Please provide recommendations of Perspective authors also.

Headquarters

1200 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20005 USA • Telephone: (+1) 202-326-6550 • Fax (+1) 202-408-1256

Europe Office

Bateman House, 82-88 Hills road, Cambridge CB2 1LQ, UK • Telephone: (+44) 1223-326500 • Fax: (+44) 1223 326501

Published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science