

FOR PEER REVIEW - CONFIDENTIAL

Vps8 overexpression inhibits HOPS-dependent trafficking routes by outcompeting Vps41/Lt

Tracking no: 29-01-2019-ADV-eLife-45631

Impact statement: Our previous and present data indicate that pre-assembled tethering complexes miniCORVET and HOPS are recruited to target membranes independent of each other.

Competing interests: No competing interests declared

Author contributions:

Péter Lőrincz: Conceptualization; Data curation; Supervision; Investigation; Visualization; Methodology; Writing—original draft; Writing—review and editing Lili Kenéz: Data curation; Investigation; Visualization; Methodology; Writing—original draft Sarolta Tóth: Data curation; Investigation; Visualization Viktória Kiss: Investigation Ágnes Varga: Investigation Tamás Csizmadia: Investigation Zsófia Simon-Vecsei: Investigation Gábor Juhász: Conceptualization; Supervision; Funding acquisition; Investigation; Project administration; Writing—review and editing

Funding:

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and interpretation, or the decision to submit the work for publication.

Data Availability:

All data generated or analysed during this study are included in the manuscript and supporting files.

N/A

Ethics:

Human Subjects: No Animal Subjects: No

Information for reviewers (full submissions):

eLife aims to publish work of the highest scientific standards and importance in all areas of the life and biomedical sciences, from the most basic and theoretical work through to translational, applied and clinical research. Articles must be methodologically and scientifically rigorous, ethically conducted, and objectively presented according to the appropriate community standards.

You will be asked for a general assessment and a summary of any major concerns (ideally in fewer than 500 words), as well as a list of any minor comments (optional). You will also have the opportunity to comment on the statistical rigour of the work (optional).

In your general assessment, please articulate what is exciting and whether the work represents a significant contribution. Please note our guidelines about requests for additional work:

1. We will only request new work, such as experiments, analyses, or data collection, if the new data are essential to support the major conclusions. The authors must be able to do any new work in a reasonable time frame (additional work should be conducted and written up within two months); otherwise, we will usually reject the manuscript.
2. Any requests for new work must fall within the scope of the current submission and the technical expertise of the authors.

Our goal is to make peer review constructive and collaborative: after the reviews have been submitted independently, there is an online discussion between the reviewers in which each reviewer will see the identity of the other reviewers.