



## Instructions for Reviewers of Technical Comments and Responses

**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

**Technical Comments and Responses** discuss research published in *Science* in the past 6 months. They should focus on analyzing the core data or analyses in the published paper and are not intended for publication of new research results meriting a full paper elsewhere. They are published online with abstracts in print. Technical Comments should merit additional attention beyond that afforded by briefer online comments directly associated with a paper.

**Overall Recommendation:** If possible, please provide separate reviews for each Comment and Response. Technical Responses are not shared with the comment author prior to publication or rejection. Only those referee comments pertinent to the Comment or Response will be forwarded to the respective authors.

On the basis of the mission statement above, recommend in your review whether the comment and reply 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 arguments address or clarify substantially a fundamental point of the original paper or provide an enlightening discussion worthy of bringing to the attention of our broader readership and merit attention beyond that of an online comment.

**Novelty:** Indicate in your review if the conclusions are novel or are too similar to material already published, including in discussions on the internet.

**Length.** Technical Comments and Responses should be of roughly equal length and no more than 1000 words each. Both comment and reply may include up to 2 figures/tables.

**Supplementary Materials.** Supplementary Materials include methods, text or data that is of interest only to the specialist, but that is still necessary for the integrity and excellence of the Comment or Response. It must be directly related to the conclusions. Your review should include an evaluation of the Supplementary Materials.

**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.

**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 as indicated on our online review form.

**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 form at <http://mcc.submit2science.org>. To login, use your user ID (it is included on the email notifying you of the review) and the password you have set. We can also receive reviews by email to [science\\_reviews@aaas.org](mailto:science_reviews@aaas.org) or by FAX to 202-408-1256.

#### 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*