Supplemental Table S1: Examples of demeaning statements made by peer reviewers towards authors. Typographical and grammatical errors were retained from the author’s original comment.

|  |
| --- |
|   |
| Demeaning Statements  |
| Only the meagerest of efforts was required to see the value, or lack there of, of this work  |
| Utterly disapointed in this submission, it achieves nothing, and was a waste of funding  |
| Either the authors didn't read my previous review or they are unable to grasp the subtlties  |
| I have rewritten so much of this troubled paper that I should be included as an author |
| There inability to grasp even the basic elements of my previous comments makes me hesitatnt to offer even more comments as they will just not understand them |
| The authors clearly do not understand even the simplest aspect of….. |
| It was garbae when I read it first and its still garbae  |
| Analysis was bad and made me forget what I already knew about ANOVA |
| Your rebuttal on the surface appears intellient but shows a tragic lack of depth and your personal limitations  |
| Their refusal to make my suggested changes shows their poor understanding of science  |
| The authors use a method that they developed and which so far only they use. I wonder why that is |
| This mansucirpt was not worth my time so I did not read it and recommend rejection  |
| The issue addressed here is so obvious it is clear a lack of originatily will limit them  |
| As english is clearly a problem I suggest other authors give this a good read |
| I tried to find something redeaming but failed to do so |
| I did not give a detailed review as the work was not worth it |
| The authors are either clearly incompenent or purposely misrepresent their work |
| Seems strange the authors would be unaware of this basic fact |
| Given the quality of this work I question the apparent qualifications of the authors  |
| The authors clearly have little experience with these methods |
| The writing is aweful |
| I hope senior colleauges can help salvage this  |
| nieve and simplistic view  |
| If the authors want to publish knowing the results are unrealiable I guess that is there problem |
| It is clear the authors are not native enlish speakers  |
| this is wishful thinking  |
| consult any book about this topic  |
| clearly the authors are following a template they picked up somewhere |
| as is common from research from China |
| if they were more fully informed they would go with the latest science, which is machine learning |
| basically follow a phantasy set up |
| this paper and its science will be another one of the hollow and non-achieving papers |
| the authors seem to think their goals are scientifically valid |
| I mean, how outdated is that |
| the authors provide us with a nice example what they can, and cannot do, and how they (wrongly) understand nature and ecology  |
| With so many native English speaking co-authors, it should be easy to rectify this |
| authors feel forced to create artificial importance  |
| It leaves me with the feeling that authors a very partial view on the topic or are just not familiar with the literature |
| Considering your methods, this is too pretentious |
| attempt to convince a naïve general audience that  |
| basically cute jargon that does not add to level of understanding |
| that is totally distracting, just the author trying to be clever |
| the results of this experiment are difficult to believe. |
| the authors have created a novel and worthless metric that completely obscures  |
| If there are any solid results from this experiment |
| the result of attending university in a developing country |
| this young lady is lucky to have been mentored by the leading men in the field |
| I’m not sure if the discussion could be even more basic |
| Pointless tests of widely accepted phenomenon? Maybe. |
| But the experimental design is decidedly 'old fashioned' |
| I stingily recommend that a native english speaker goes through the MS and sorts out some of the harder to understand parts. |
| Authors should ask for help of a colleague whose first language is English, |
| This is dismal to read, |
| Nothing new is added, why was this study even done? |
| The experiments to determine this is obvious, so their inability to conduct them is baffling |
| other methods are avilable to collect actual data |
| why they bother to even resubmit this is beyond me |
| maybe get a native English speaker to proofread the manuscript  |
| this is worthless, hense I totally ignore  |
| would be lucky to be published in a less prestigious journal let alone |
| A native english speaker would  |
| No contrasts with other studies! They are either behind latest advnces or left these studies out t inflat their own impact |
| they have FINALLY incorperated my earlier comments |
| Another review on a a topic that has collect so many reviews that nothing new is ever added |
| This writing in the introduction is not high quality and should be reviewed by a native English speaker |
| Discussion was dull  |
| This section was very dull  |
| Discussion was boring  |
| carefully proof-read by a native speaker. |
| in a methodologically grossly inadequate manner, which is further highlighted by the fact that the trial was unethical |
|  |

Supplemental Figure S1: Flow diagram depicting inclusion of reviewer comment sets.
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