

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*. Mentions of prior referee reports have been redacted.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer #1:

Remarks to the Author:

I am satisfied with the changes made to the manuscript by authors and with their replies to previous referees' comments. I recommend publishing the revised manuscript in Nature communications.

Reviewer #2:

Remarks to the Author:

The points that I've raised in the first report were addressed in the revised version satisfactory. The only exception is that I recommend that the authors discuss possible materials where the experiments can be done, accompanying it with a quantitative estimates. If this is done, even briefly, I think that the paper deserves to be published in Nature Communications.