

**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):

The authors have adequately addressed our concerns and the manuscript is much improved in response to comments from all three reviewers. This work will be of interest to many readers and I look forward to seeing it published.

Reviewer #2 (Remarks to the Author):

The authors replied all my comments and made all necessary edits. I don't have further comments on the paper.

Reviewer #3 (Remarks to the Author):

The authors have performed a substantial amount of new analysis, addressing all of my previous concerns. The authors have also integrated their novel analysis into the main and supplemental texts, and have refined their conclusions accordingly. I support publication of the paper as is in its current form

## REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

### Reviewer #1 (Remarks to the Author):

The authors have adequately addressed our concerns and the manuscript is much improved in response to comments from all three reviewers. This work will be of interest to many readers and I look forward to seeing it published.

### Reviewer #2 (Remarks to the Author):

The authors replied all my comments and made all necessary edits. I don't have further comments on the paper.

### Reviewer #3 (Remarks to the Author):

The authors have performed a substantial amount of new analysis, addressing all of my previous concerns. The authors have also integrated their novel analysis into the main and supplemental texts, and have refined their conclusions accordingly. I support publication of the paper as is in its current form

*We thank all 3 reviewers for their comments which undoubtedly led to substantial improvements in the manuscript.*