

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 my questions. As the MS focused on in vitro profiling and the biological relevance of these findings were unclear, it is more of a resource story.

Reviewer #2 (Remarks to the Author):

Given the inherent restrictions on their analyses the authors have provide new information that make their findings more convincing.

REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

Reviewer #1 (Remarks to the Author):

The authors have adequately addressed my questions. As the MS focused on in vitro profiling and the biological relevance of these findings were unclear, it is more of a resource story.

[We thank the reviewer for their positive feedback.](#)

Reviewer #2 (Remarks to the Author):

Given the inherent restrictions of their analyses the authors have provided new information that make their findings more convincing.

[We thank the reviewer for their positive feedback.](#)