



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 <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

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 manuscript by Seger, Gong and co-workers has been revised thoroughly and many clarifications have been added. The authors undertook an enormous effort (including a set of additional experiments) to tackle all comments and questions raised during my first review. After carefully reading the response from the authors I am satisfied with the current version of the manuscript. Therefore, I recommend publication in Nature Communications.

Reviewer #2 (Remarks to the Author):

The authors have carefully addressed all points raised by the referees. The quality of the report is improved and publication is now recommended without further revision.