

BMJ Open Science

BMJ Open Science uses compulsory open peer review. Your name and institution will be returned to the authors and will be published with this review if the article is accepted.

By submitting your review you agree to have your name and review published as supplementary information to the article. The review will be given a DOI and be made available under a Creative Commons CC BY licence. This also applies to any comments submitted to the discussion forum which would be instigated by the Associate Editor.

I agree

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared':

Review Checklist

Please elaborate on any 'No' answers in the comments section below.

1. Is the research question or study objective clearly defined?

Yes No N/A

2. Is the abstract accurate (i.e. reflect the content of the article), balanced and complete?

Yes No N/A

3. Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question (including the use of appropriate controls)?

Yes No N/A

4. Are the methods described sufficiently to allow the study to be repeated?

Yes No N/A

4a. **Randomisation:** have the authors described how samples/animals were allocated to experimental groups? If randomisation is not described have they explained why it was not possible or would not have been appropriate?

Yes No N/A

4b. **Blinding:** were the investigators blinded to group allocation during the experiment and/or analysis. If blinding is not described have they explained why it was not possible or would not have been appropriate?

Yes No N/A

4c. **Sample size calculation:** have the authors described the basis of how sample size was determined? If a sample size calculation is not described have they explained why it was not possible or would not have been appropriate?

Yes No N/A

4d. **Inclusion/exclusion:** have the authors described any a priori inclusion/exclusion criteria and any animals, samples or data excluded from analysis, and the reasons for this?

Yes No N/A

5. Are research ethics (e.g. ethics approval) addressed appropriately?

Yes No N/A

6. Are the outcomes clearly defined?

Yes No N/A

7. If statistics are used are they appropriate and described fully?

Yes No N/a

8. Do the references cite the most recent relevant advances in the field?

Yes No N/A

9. Do the results address the research question or objective?

Yes No N/A

10. Are they presented clearly?

Yes No N/A

11. Are the discussion and conclusions justified by the results

Yes No N/A

12. Are the study limitations discussed adequately?

Yes No N/A

13. Is the supplementary reporting complete (e.g. ARRIVE checklist, PRISMA checklist, study registration; funding details)?

Yes No N/A

14. Do you have any concerns about publication ethics (e.g. plagiarism, redundant publication, undeclared conflicts of interest)?

Yes No N/A

15. Is the standard of written English acceptable for publication?

Yes No N/A

Statistics

Does this paper require specialist statistical review?

Yes Yes and I have performed this review No

Recommendation

Accept Minor Revision Major Revision Reject

Comments

Please leave your comments for the authors below

COMMENT BOX