

# TOP IMPACT ENGLISH EDITING

SCIENTIFIC REPORT

## Specifications

Comments from Scientific Reviewer and Editor, Senior Publication  
Quality Specialist and Senior Language Editor

Summary and Next Steps for Author/s



### ***Message from the Top Impact Editing team***

...

Thank you for choosing Enago to assist you in peer reviewing and editing of the manuscript to publish in top-ranking journals. We have assessed the appropriateness of study design, relevance of methodology, and significance of your findings to attract the reader's attention. We have also ensured the clarity and flow of content, and structured and formatted it according to your target journal. We have prepared this customized report that gives you a scientific as well as language assessment status of your paper, along with a list of improvement areas addressed by us. We have suggested revisions to minimize chances of journal rejection. Please read this report along with the comments in the revised manuscript and respond to them. You are also requested to confirm if the revisions clearly present your study and are appropriate to the best of your knowledge.



Assignment details	
Assignment Code	ABCDE-1
Manuscript Title	Shared Expression of Mucin12 in both Ascaris Lumbricoides and Human Small Intestine
Total word count	1747 words
Article Type	Original Research Article
Journal name and URL	Molecular and Biochemical Parasitology; <a href="https://www.journals.elsevier.com/molecular-and-biochemical-parasitology">https://www.journals.elsevier.com/molecular-and-biochemical-parasitology</a>

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Research Strength</b> .....	4
• Summary .....	4
• Originality and Significance of Research .....	4
<b>Content Review</b> .....	4
• Title, Abstract, and Keywords .....	4
• Introduction and Literature review .....	5
• Methods and Statistical Analysis .....	5
• Results and Discussion .....	6
• Figures and Tables .....	6
• Conclusion .....	7
• References .....	7
<b>Structure, Style, and Format review</b> .....	7
• Clarity of presentation .....	7
• Organization and Structure .....	8
• Format and Style .....	8
• Authorship .....	8
<b>Suitability to journal instructions</b> .....	8
• <b>Manuscript compatibility</b> .....	8
<b>Conclusive statements from the expert</b> .....	9



## RESEARCH STRENGTH

### ○ SUMMARY

This article is focused towards identification of the antigen secreted by human *Ascaris lumbricoides* in small intestine. This commonest parasite in the world infects the human small intestine after the humans ingest mature eggs of the parasite. It is presumed that adult *A. lumbricoides* live in their preferred environment, which is the small intestine, by secreting mucin12 to avoid being attacked by the host immune system. The authors obtained three DNA clones by screening for common antigenicity using a human colon cDNA library and anti-*A. lumbricoides* polyclonal antibodies. After sequencing analysis, the transmembrane mucin12 gene was identified as the gene of interest.

### ○ ORIGINALITY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF RESEARCH [Rating: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor]

#### Good

The study appears to be novel. The reason behind this study is incredibly sound and the research into this area is very interesting. Determining how helminths evade the immune system is an important mechanism in understanding type 2 immunity. Additionally, generation of antibodies to mucins seem to be implicated in autoimmune diseases. Thus, this study is important to the field. However, the authors need to improve the manuscript based on the above suggestions in order to improve the weightage of his findings.

The research content is acceptable but the study would be highly beneficial and would have better prospectus, if all revisions as mentioned are done and the missing data provided.

- The article has all the required sections for an article, but needs some revision.
- The study is very relevant to the field of drug industry, pharmaceuticals as well as healthcare industry.

## CONTENT REVIEW

### ○ TITLE, ABSTRACT, AND KEYWORDS

The title adequately reflects the theme of the paper, is concise, and fits well within the guidelines of the selected journal in this research area. However, title page according to journal standards is not fulfilled. In addition, the title "Mucin12 contribute common antigenicity of host-parasite relationship between *Ascaris Lumbricoides* and Human" contains some grammatical issues and doesn't best represent what the core research focus of the manuscript is about. Muc12 doesn't technically contribute to the common antigenicity but instead is the antigen expressed by both *Ascaris* and human. Instead, we suggest a more succinct and detailed title such as "Shared Expression of Mucin12 in both *Ascaris lumbricoides* and human small intestine"

- Add the following details:

1. Author names and affiliations
2. Corresponding author details
3. Complete postal address of corresponding author

The abstract does present the purpose and significance of the study. However, the structure of the abstract is very poorly defined. It does not properly summarize the content of the article. Start the abstract on its own page instead of continuing on the title page. The heading "summary" should be changed to "Abstract" as per journal's requirement. We have edited the abstract to make the content easily understandable for the readers. Also, we have reduced the word count from 239 to 225 to adhere to the journal guidelines.

Overall, the abstract contains long and confusing sentences and is filled with jargon. For example, the sentence "The purpose of this research is to focus on the host specificity of human *A. lumbricoides* which is



parasitic in the small intestine and to examine, at a genetic level, the common antigenicity existing in *A. lumbricoides* and human small intestinal mucosa to unravel the host-parasite relationship” is very long. This sentence would be cleaner and easier read as “The purpose of this research is to focus on the host specificity of human *A. lumbricoides*, a parasitic in the small intestine. As part of this investigation, we examined, at a genetic level, the common antigenicity existing in *A. lumbricoides* and human small intestinal mucosa to unravel the host-parasite relationship.” Additionally, use of the word “clones” is jargon and confusing. Were these clones of the genome, cells, or tissues? When describing mucin12 expression or antibody binding to mucin12, it would be most ideal if you clarify which organism (helminth or mammalian host) you are referring to in the sentence.

## ○ INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The structure of this section should be revised. You should revise the introduction and make it more concise in the light of those findings. The whole purpose of this study is to understand the mechanism of molecular mimicry that *A. lumbricoides* uses to go undetected within the mammalian host. Understanding of this concept would be greatly heightened if you describe how *A. lumbricoides* is contracted and its life cycle within the mammalian host in the introduction. The subject of the second paragraph is a little confusing at first. This is mostly due to the very confusing first sentence: “From the host’s biological defence reaction, it is described that the host’s immunological escape mechanism evades immunity by mutating glycoprotein on the body surface, the parasite expressing matter quite similar to it on the host’s body surface, thus avoiding immunity by inhibiting the host’s immune system1.” How can the host have an immunological escape mechanism if it is the host? Are you describing the parasites? We are not exactly sure the point you are trying to make here but we think it is about how the parasite mutates glycoproteins (unsure of whether this is on its surface or the host’s surface) to evade immunological detection. To help clarify, in the beginning of the second paragraph, please state that *A. lumbricoides* uses multiple mechanisms to go undetected within the host and then proceed to state examples. Some of these examples are given in the next paragraph such as how helminth can extract sialic acid from the host, express hyaluronidase receptor, and induce protective and remodelling cytokines. Thus, you might be able to combine the paragraphs and make this section more concise.

The language of the article needed revisions, which we have now addressed in the edited manuscript. We have also made the article more concise to avoid unnecessary lengthy discussions. Many vital details have not been addressed. Other information that would be helpful in the introduction is description of the expression of mucins in *A. lumbricoides* and other helminths and expression of Muc12, and other isoforms within the mammalian host. Descriptions of these data are included in the discussion. A few sentences about these concepts would be a great way to start to frame the data. You should also refer to the detailed comments in the manuscript for sections applicable and revise.

## ○ METHODS AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The experiments are adequate to answer the research question. However, you have not mentioned very important details about methodologies. Approval for the use of rabbits for generation of polyclonal serum and health human tissue for staining of mucin isoforms is not described in the materials and methods. How was healthy intestinal tissue obtained and what are the characteristics of this human cohort (age, sex, and definition of “health”).

Parts of the materials and methods section are very unclear. Under “Preparation of *A. lumbricoides* crude antigen and polyclonal antibody” it was stated that “rabbits were immunized using the crude antigen of *A. lumbricoides* for 4 times a week interval and the sera were collected.” It would be ideal to know the amount of antigen that was injected during these times and whether an adjuvant was used. The plaque assay described in “Screening using human colon cDNA library” is complicated and confusing. Is there a previous study that has published on this method? Can you cite it in the methods and state others have used it before?



While identifying the site of mucin12 localization in *A. lumbricoides*, it would be good to know where the *A. lumbricoides* was obtained from, what form of the parasite (infective or intestinal?) was frozen, and how the helminth was frozen. These unclear contents were missed by you to mention in this section. All such details have been elaborately discussed in the comments section. You have not mentioned anything about whether a commercial Muc12 antibody used to confirm the polyclonal antibody. For details, kindly refer to the comments section in the manuscript.

## ○ RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results appear complete and are represented adequately. The results have been explained with discussion but the findings are not properly interpreted. Please describe how the screening of “clones” or “plaques” was done at the beginning of the results section to help clarify the data in this section with the reader. Were false positive plaques obtained by accident or on purpose? If on accident just state that overall 3 positive plaques were obtained. Was the fragment of homology (756 bases to 1144 base) used to immunize rabbits? If not, how homologous are these fragments to each other?

All interpretations seem to be based on the previous literature. Overall, the findings of the present study in the light of previous findings are clearly defined. The supporting literature is sufficient enough and the conclusions hence drawn are understandable.

Proper detailed suggestions are provided in the comments. Please refer to them.

No statistical analyses are performed and significance values are all missing for the biological assays.

The discussion part is detailed and clearly presents the results. Be sure that when describing an organism for the first time to state both the genus and species. In the discussion, *C. parvum* is described for the first time as such, instead of as *Cryptosporidium parvum*. Please check and make the changes accordingly.

Additionally, sometimes new paragraphs are started after a sentence or two. This results in a longer section about the same topic. Please try to cluster 5-6 related sentences in paragraphs. Overall, the information in the discussion is very interesting and very relevant however it is disorganized. Antibodies to different mucin isoforms and their association with disease and expression of these mucins in parasites are described and then a few paragraphs later are a description of what mucins, their composition, and different isoforms. This would obviously be the most helpful and descriptive earlier on.

The limitations of the study have not been highlighted. The significance of the findings in light of the past studies and present novelty has to be emphasized. Do helminth infected individuals have increased antibodies to helminth-derived mucins? Detailed similar comments have been added in the manuscript file. You are advised to address all mentioned issues.

## ○ FIGURES AND TABLES

The figures provided are represented well, however, one of the figures was cited without a figure number.

In figure 1, the homologous sequence is highlighted in the ORF but should also be highlighted in the amino acid sequence. Was a portion of this sequence used to immunize rabbits? In the figure legend of figure 1, more detailed information should be given about the methods of how clones were screened and how this homologous sequence was identified. In the legend of figure 2, *A. Lumbricoides* should be stated as *A. lumbricoides* (with a lower case L). This figure legend should include more detail about how the worm was frozen, how thick sections were cut, and for what concentration and time the sections were stained with antibody. In figure 2, the figure legend should include information about for how healthy tissue was obtained, treated, and fixed for staining. Additionally, labelling the pathology or cellular morphology of the Muc12 stained *A. lumbricoides* and human intestine sections on the actual images would be incredibly helpful to the interpretation of this data.

No tables were included in this manuscript.





## ○ CONCLUSION

The conclusion is concise. However, you have not been able to highlight the significance and use of this method in clinical uses. Even though we understand now how the “clones” were obtained, use of this term is still confusing. It might be easier to say “peptide library” or “antigen screen” to describe the assay. Since you came to the same conclusion about antibodies to Muc12 binding to *A. lumbricoides* and human small intestines, and these binding were subsided with pre-absorption using peptide, it may be easier to combine these concepts and sentences for the conclusion. A sentence about the broad implications of this study such as “these data suggest that expression of mucin proteins by helminths may be one mechanism by which the helminth evades immunological detection within the mammalian host” can be included.

- No future prospectus of the study has been detailed out.

## ○ REFERENCES

Most of the recent findings have been cited in the manuscript.

Citations in the following section are lacking:

“Mucins are mucous glycosylated proteins covering inner cavities such as the trachea, the digestive tract including the stomach and intestines, and the gonads. There is secretory mucin which is the main component of mucus and transmembrane mucin which is associated with the cell membrane. Mucin has high molecular weight, higher than 1 million holding numerous sugar chains associated with polypeptide through O-linked glycoside. The protein core of mucin is coded by various mucin genes. Most mucins are rich in serine and threonine, formed by a variable number of tandem repetition.”

“Regarding the homology with the mucin family, mucin3 showed homologous with amino acid sequence from 238 to 585 (30%) in mucin12, and mucin17 showed homologous with amino acid sequence from 238 to 581 (38%) in mucin12.”

## ○ Other comments, if any

The journal instructs to provide highlights for the study. You are advised to provide 3-4 bulleted highlight points of 85 characters each. They should be concise yet expressive of the key points of the research to draw the attention of the readers.

## STRUCTURE, STYLE, AND FORMAT REVIEW

### ○ CLARITY OF PRESENTATION

The quality of presentation in the article is average. Although the aim of the study is highlighted adequately, there are many sections including introduction that were not appropriately structured. The writing throughout the article is not clear and concise. The flow of language throughout the article appears ambiguous at many places. Additionally, the article had many grammatical errors, which we have rectified in the edited manuscript. Many sections of this paper were very confusing. This was the result of long sentences, short paragraphs, confusion between description of the helminth or human, use of jargon, incomplete methods, and disorganization of sections. We have reworked the sections as described and have provided suggestions wherever applicable. Data described in the discussion are ideal for the broad understanding of these data. Emphasis on the life cycle of the parasite in the introduction would be beneficial. Many sections as pointed out in the comments needed major revision/rephrasing which we have addressed. Please check and confirm if the research presentation is in line with your experimental makeup of the study.



## ○ ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE

The article is structured into logical sections. The appropriate data were included in the ideal section of this manuscript. The data included in the discussion section frame the data obtained from this study well, however this section is disorganized. With a reorganization of paragraphs, and consolidation of this information, this discussion section will be great. Please check the revisions done by us in the manuscript.

## ○ FORMAT AND STYLE

The length of the article is as per standard guidelines of a journal that publishes similar research findings, although this journal has not specified any word count limit. Include page and line numbers.

Try to start sections on a new page

Change “summary” to “abstract”

In the “abbreviations” section, two different fonts are used. Please clean this up in preparation for submission. Some parts of the text are in different colors, but it is unclear about why. The abstract had been edited by us to bring the total word count within the limit specified in the journal guidelines.

There is no limit of word count in introduction section. The sections in main manuscript should be numbered. Divide the article into numbered sections. Subsections should be numbered 1.1 (then 1.1.1, 1.1.2, ...), 1.2, etc. We have formatted the manuscript according to the journal’s instructions.

When describing data generated by your lab or by the author, please state “we” or “our” instead of talking about the data in 3rd person.

## ○ AUTHORSHIP

It complies with the journal’s guidelines; however, you should provide a declaration of interest. It is mandatory for the journal.

## SUITABILITY TO JOURNAL INSTRUCTIONS

### Journal Scope

‘Molecular and Biochemical Parasitology’ is a journal within the field of molecular biology and biochemistry that is interested in papers that report about host-parasite relationships focused on the parasite, particularly as related to specific parasite molecules. It also welcomes papers that deal with analysis of genes and genome structure, function and expression, analysis of variation in parasite populations relevant to genetic exchange, pathogenesis, drug and vaccine target characterization, and drug resistance, and parasite protein trafficking, organelle biogenesis, and cellular structure especially with reference to the roles of specific molecules.

Since you have investigated the mechanism of molecular mimicry between *A. lumbricoides* and mammalian host and demonstrated that a homologous protein (muc12) is responsible for this, it fits the scope of the journal perfectly.

### Journal quality and coverage

Impact factor – 1.571

Indexed databases – BIOSIS Citation Index, Embase, PubMed/Medline, Reference Update, Tropical Diseases Bulletin

Quartile ranking – Q2

## ○ MANUSCRIPT COMPATIBILITY

The scope of this study is in line with the aims/scope of the recommended journal. However, you should make all the revisions as suggested. The manuscript is a pioneer in the field of molecular biology, host pathogenicity and parasitology, and many similar studies have been published recently.





The journal's indexing in well-reputed databases will ensure wide readership.

This journal specifically publishes data on molecular and biochemical studies on the mode of action of antiparasitic drugs, molecular and biochemical aspects of membrane structure and function, molecular and biochemical aspects of host parasite relationships including analysis of parasitic escape mechanisms. This fits well with the scope of the current study.

### CONCLUSIVE STATEMENTS FROM THE EXPERT

Overall, this paper has a great deal of potential. The reviewers' comments are mostly addressable; however, some important issues regarding clarity about the broad implications of this study, and making the content presentation clearer and concise is required. The revised paper has a better chance of publication in the target journal.

SAMPLE



# ACKNOWLEDGE

## Scientific Editing Support

The Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) & ICMJE guidelines specify that the English language reviewers (non-authors) of your manuscript should be acknowledged. We request you to simply include this sentence to comply:

"The authors would like to thank Enago ([www.enago.com](http://www.enago.com)) for the manuscript review and editing support."

