

## Pre-submission review

Assignment Number: **MIKHAW-4**

Paper Title: **Allogeneic component to overcome rejection in interspecific pregnancy**

Total document length: 2 pages

Number of Figures: 1

Number of Tables: 0

Target: Wikiversity

URL:

[https://en.wikiversity.org/wiki/Allogeneic component to overcome rejection in interspecific pregnancy](https://en.wikiversity.org/wiki/Allogeneic_component_to_overcome_rejection_in_interspecific_pregnancy)

*This is a peer review of the article " **Allogeneic component to overcome rejection in interspecific pregnancy** ", which as of March 18th 2014 is displayed online at the following URL:*

[https://en.wikiversity.org/wiki/Allogeneic component to overcome rejection in interspecific pregnancy](https://en.wikiversity.org/wiki/Allogeneic_component_to_overcome_rejection_in_interspecific_pregnancy)

## Manuscript Development

Section	Comments
Title	<p>The title is not very clear as the word ‘component’ implies the involvement of some sort of part of the immune system, while the article seems to refer to implantation of an entire embryo. Something like ‘Use of an allogeneic approach to overcoming rejection in interspecific pregnancy’ might be a bit more clear.</p>
Main text	<p>This is a short explanation of two methods that can be used to overcome immune rejection of a xenogeneic pregnancy. However I believe that other methods have also been demonstrated to have some success, for example treatment with progesterone [Progesterone Inhibits Rejection of Xenogeneic Transplants in the Sheep Uterus, Majewski A.C. Hansen P.J. Horm Res 2002;58:128–135 (DOI: 10.1159/000063578)]</p> <p>The explanation of the mechanism involved in rejection of a xenogeneic embryo, and in protection from this reaction, is also somewhat limited. Other publications have suggested that more than one mechanism may be involved, and that different mechanisms may predominate in different species.</p>
References	<p>The references are not all in the same format; only reference 3 lists the authors.</p> <p>The reference list is also quite limited; other significant articles should be included, for example a significant review from 1988 by G.B Anderson (<a href="http://www.biolreprod.org/content/38/1/1.full.pdf">http://www.biolreprod.org/content/38/1/1.full.pdf</a>), and the book ‘Immunology of pregnancy’ edited by G. Chaouat, CRC Press, 1993, as well as other articles including, for example, those by Buckrell et al., 1990 (J. Reprod. Fert. 90, 387–94) and Widayati and Fukuta, 2012 (Jurnal Kedokteran Hewan, vol. 6 no. 2, 61–6).</p>
Figure	<p>The figure shows the technique of immunosurgery quite clearly.</p>
Authorship	<p>No conflicts of interest have been declared.</p>

## Quality of Article

Rating	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Comments
Clarity of presentation			X		
Organization and Structure		X			
Evidence supports conclusion			X		
Adequacy of literature review				X	
<b>Overall Rating</b>			X		

## Next Steps

List the three most important improvements that the author needs to make. Make sure that you have suggested constructive solutions to these problems.

1. Mention whether other methods have been shown to prevent rejection.
2. Include other published hypotheses which may also explain how interspecies rejection can be overcome.
3. Expand the reference list.

List the three most important strengths of this paper which the author should not lose in the process of revision.

1. A clear explanation of interspecific pregnancy.
2. A clear illustration of immunosurgery.
3. Very succinct and on the whole easy to read.

Conflicts of interest: None declared.

This text is available under the Creative Commons Attribution/Share-Alike 3.0 Unported License.