
SREP-15-21934B Revise Review Instructions for Scientific Reports

1 message

scientificreports@nature.com <scientificreports@nature.com>

Fri, Dec 4, 2015 at 11:50 PM

Reply-To: scientificreports@nature.com

To: scguo@ucsd.edu

Dear Dr Guo,

The following manuscript has been revised in response to your previous comments SREP-15-21934B; "Distinct mutation accumulation rates among tissues determine the variation in cancer risk" by Dapeng Hao, Li Wang, and Li-jun Di.

Papers published in Scientific Reports should be technically sound and scientifically valid. i.e. the methods must be appropriate and properly conducted, and the conclusions drawn must be fully supported by the data presented.

Scientific Reports, unlike other journals published by Nature Publishing Group, does not assess papers based on perceived importance, significance or impact. Referees are not asked to make a judgement on the importance of the study - we ask the scientific community to make this judgement themselves post-publication.

To access the manuscript, review form, and instructions please click on the link below.

<http://mts-srep.nature.com/cgi-bin/main.plex?el=A1CG1RPy7C1Bzpu7F6A9ftdjybnLioSaN207zsYIV433AZ>

Please visit our guide to referees for more information: <http://www.nature.com/srep/referees/index.html>

If you are unable to complete the review or expect significant delays, please contact us immediately via e-mail.

The contents of the manuscript are, of course, confidential until published.

The review form will rapidly allow you to provide feedback in the following areas:

- Is the paper technically sound?
- Are the claims convincing? If not, what further evidence is needed?
- Are the claims fully supported by the experimental data?
- Are the claims appropriately discussed in the context of previous literature?
- If the manuscript is unacceptable in its present form, does the study seem sufficiently promising that the authors should be encouraged to consider a resubmission in the future?

In addition to answering the previous questions, you can provide further information as free-text, including comments that may answer the following:

- Is the manuscript clearly written? If not, how could it be made more accessible?
- Have the authors done themselves justice without overselling their claims?
- Have they been fair in their treatment of previous literature?
- Have they provided sufficient methodological detail that the experiments could be reproduced?
- Is the statistical analysis of the data sound?
- Are there any special ethical concerns arising from the use of animals or human subjects?

Regards,

Manuscript Administration
Scientific Reports
4 Crinan Street

London N1 9XW

E-mail: scientificreports@nature.com

This email has been sent through the NPG Manuscript Tracking System NY-610A-NPG&MTS

Confidentiality Statement:

This e-mail is confidential and subject to copyright. Any unauthorised use or disclosure of its contents is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify our Manuscript Tracking System Helpdesk team at <http://platformsupport.nature.com> .

Details of the confidentiality and pre-publicity policy may be found here <http://www.nature.com/authors/policies/confidentiality.html>

[Privacy Policy](#) | [Update Profile](#)