

SCIENCE'S MISSION: *Science* seeks to publish those papers that are most influential in their fields and that will significantly advance scientific understanding. Selected papers should present novel and broadly important data, syntheses, or concepts. They should merit the recognition by the scientific community and general public provided by publication in *Science*, beyond that provided by specialty journals.

CRITERIA FOR JUDGMENT

Research Articles should report a major breakthrough in a particular field. They should be in the top 20% of the papers that *Science* publishes and be of strong interdisciplinary interest or unusual interest to the specialist.

Overall Recommendation: On the basis of the mission statement above, recommend in your review whether the paper should be published in *Science* and provide a more detailed critique based on the following:

Technical Rigor: Evaluate whether, or to what extent, the data and methods substantiate the conclusions and interpretations. If appropriate, indicate what additional data and information are needed to do so.

Novelty: Indicate in your review if the conclusions are novel or are too similar to work already published.

Data. The data necessary to support, understand, and extend the conclusions should be presented in the paper or Supporting Online material or should be deposited in a database upon publication. Data presentation should follow conventions in your field. Please comment on the whether these conditions are met or indicate how they can be.

Supplementary Materials. Supplementary Materials include methods, text, or data that is still necessary for the integrity and excellence of the paper. They must be directly related to the conclusions of the print paper and should not present additional interpretations or conclusions. Your review should include an evaluation of the Supplementary Materials.

Security: We ask reviewers to inform us if they have concerns that release of this paper may pose a danger to public health, safety, or security. Such concerns will be brought to the attention of the Editor-in-Chief for further evaluation.

Length. Research Articles may be up to 5 printed pages (4000 – 5000 words). The data and ideas should be such that they warrant more space than a Report (typically 2500 words, or 3 pages).

Science is also now accepting a few Research Articles for an online presentation (about 1 per issue). These are expected to present significant research results that cannot be fully presented in the print format and merit the extra length and attention provided in an enriched and integrated online format. These can be longer, up to 8000 words and include methods and additional figures as part of the main presentation. They should fully meet *Science*'s criteria for Research Articles. Please indicate in your review if you feel that this paper is appropriate to be featured in this format.

The final selection is based on relative quality of papers rather than absolute merit and is constrained by available space in Science and our commitment to balance subject matter.

Conflict of Interest: If you cannot judge this paper impartially, please notify us immediately. If you have any financial or professional affiliations that may be perceived as a conflict of interest in reviewing the manuscript, please describe those as indicated on our online review form.

Confidentiality: We expect reviewers to protect the confidentiality of the manuscript and ensure that it is not disseminated or exploited. Please destroy your copy of the manuscript when you are done. Only discuss the paper with a colleague with permission from the editor. We do not disclose the identity of our reviewers.

Returning your review: Please return your review using our form at <http://mcc.submit2science.org>. To login, use your user ID (it is included on the email notifying you of the review) and the password you have set. We can also receive reviews by email to science_reviews@aaas.org or by FAX to 202-408-1256.

Should this manuscript be accompanied by a Perspective?

Perspectives are short commentaries on current research published in *Science* or elsewhere. If you feel that this work deserves such a discussion for a wider audience, please include a note to the editor. Please provide recommendations of Perspective authors also.