

Thesis (PHD) Evaluation Form

It is the coordinator/student's responsibility to distribute this form along with their thesis to each member evaluator of the thesis. After the evaluation, the form should be submitted to the PhD director by email. (Prof. Beniamino Cenci Goga Dipartimento di Medicina Veterinaria, via San Costanzo 4, 06124 Perugia Italy. Tel + 39 075 5857929; email beniamino.cencigoga@unipg.it)

Student's Name: Polina Anipchenko

Degree: PhD TITLE OF THESIS/DISSERTATION:

Ovulation-inducing factor (OIFs): novel physiological mechanisms in spontaneous and reflex ovulator species

Rating range A-D (ex.A = excellent B = good C = sufficient)

Category	Rating	Comments
Research Questions/Set-up	A	The research problems to which responds the doctoral thesis has been correctly stated, not only in each one of the seven chapters but also in the Abstract and the Introduction sections of the thesis document. Overall, the thesis is well organised and structured.
Literature Review	A	This doctoral thesis identifies relevant research and literature sources, and summarizes and integrates correctly the information. In fact, two of their chapters (5 and 6) are literature review papers. However, consistency for formal aspects of the bibliographic citations in the Introduction section could be improved (see Additional comments below, for "Introduction" and "References of the Introduction section").
Methodology	A	The methodology of this research work is correctly addressed. In particular, methodology of experimental papers integrating chapters 1 to 4 and 7 has been reviewed and accepted by the article referees, and have been already published. In addition, methodology used in the review papers that compose chapters 5 and 6 is also good.
Analysis/Presentation of Results	A	Statistical analyses and presentation of results are addressed correctly. In fact, presentation of Results is clear and concise in each one of the experimental papers integrating chapters 1 to 4 and 7. Furthermore, the bibliographic reviews that are the review articles in chapters 5 and 6 adequately present the current state of knowledge on the subject.
Discussion/Implications	A	The discussion of the results is correctly addressed, with proper reference to the relevant literature in the field. Implications of finding related to ovulation-inducing factors and their physiological mechanisms both in reflex and spontaneous ovulatory species have been clearly displayed both in the seven chapters and in the conclusion section.
Quality of Writing	A	Although I am not a native English speaker (to issue an authorised opinion in this regard), I find the thesis is correctly written and it is easy to read and understand. The writing style fit well the usual in scientific writing. Moreover, the thesis is illustrated with beautiful and high quality figures, particularly in the Introduction section.
Overall Rating	A	I consider that this doctoral thesis enjoys maximum quality due to its adequate experimental design, novel results, discussion of high quality and correct and clear writing, making significant contributions in the field of ovulation-inducing factors that control the reproduction of domestic and invasive alien species.

Additional Comments (only formal minor issues have been indicated):

Abstract:

Page 3: Latin name "*Sciurus carolinensis*" must be typed in italics.

Page 3: The acronyms IL1B and IL1R1 should be defined with the full words the first time they appear in the text.

Page 5: Repeated information in the two following sentences: "Furthermore, dietary supplementation does not alter the expression of resistin. Moreover, the expression of resistin is unaffected by dietary supplementation".

Introduction:

In this section, format for citing bibliographical references is not entirely homogeneous and, in addition, it is not usual to include the initials of the authors' names in the citation. Example: "Holesh et al., 2024" better than "Holesh JE et al., 2024".

Figure 1. Figure 1: It would be interesting to add a legend to indicate the meaning of the initials: AL, PL, etc.

Page 7: Correct "Goodman et al." by removing "et al." because there is a single author.

Page 9: Correct year of Talebi et al. (2017) as 2018.

Page 10 Figure: Correct reference is "Wiesmann and de Vos." for 2001.

Page 11: In this sentence: "The research (2018) examined the presence", it is not clear which publication is being referred to.

Page 12: The reference of the citation Castellini et al. (2016) has not been included in the references section.

Page 12: Add "and Pushkina" after "Korochkina" (2024 reference).

Page 12: Add "et al." after "Korochkina" (2023 reference)

Page 13: Latin name "*Sciurus carolinensis*" must be typed in italics.

Page 3: Latin name "*Sciurus vulgaris*" must be typed in italics.

Page 13: Unclear bibliographic citation: "Maranesi M, Bufalari A et al., 2020".

Page 13: Reference in the figure: 2020a or 202b? There are two references for Maranesi et al. (2020).

Page 14: Reference in the figure: 2020a or 202b? There are two references for Maranesi et al. (2020).

Page 15: Remove et al. At "Martin".

Page 15: Type “*ADIPOQ*” in italics at “the *ADIPOQ* gene” because the notation of genes is done by writing their name in italics.

Page 16: The reference for Ocón-Grove OM et al., 2008 is lacking in the References section.

Page 17: Figure 7: it would be interesting to indicate the meaning of “IC” initials that appears in the left image of the upper row.

Page 18: Add “and Rissman” to “Kauffman”.

Page 19: Figure: 8: Revise whether all the initials and in the figure title have been defined with the full words (for example, “nerve growth factor (NGF)”).

Page 20: Replace citation “Biology of Reproduction, vol. 98, Issue 5, 2018” with the citation by the system “Author, year”.

Page 21: Remove “et al.” at “Robertson et al.”

Page 22: Correct “Di Paolo et al.” as “Di Paolo and Shayakhmetov”.

Page 22: The reference of citation “Maranesi et al. 2024” has not been included in the References section.

Page 23: It is said that “resent” research on rabbits resulted in the initial characterization of the inflammatory responses observed in females post-mating, but the bibliographic references provided here are old, from 1952 and 1977.

Page 23: Replace “et al.” with “Replace with “and Mahler” at “Phillips et al.”

Page 24: Delete “et al.” after “Krisher”.

Page 25: add “et al.” to “Jefferson”.

Page 26: Replace “et al.” with “and Fortune” at “Voss et al.”

Pages 27-28: Avoid the table title be cut between two pages.

Page 30: Revise whether “Dall’Aglia (2019)” citation is “Dall’Aglia et al. (2019)”, because the References section does not contain a reference for “Dall’Aglia (2019)”.

References of the Introduction section (pages 32 to 43):

The referencing format of the bibliography has not been standardized.

Reference Castellini et al. (2019) has not been cited in the Introduction section.

Reference 43: correct publishing year as 2025, rather than 2024.

References 65 and 66: 2020a or 2020b? There are two references for Maranesi et al. (2020).

Conclusions:

Page 147: Add “and Tabandeh” to “Rahmanifar”.

Page 148: Add "et al." to "Camino".

Page 149: Add "et al." to "Patel".

Page 149: Add "et al." to "Silvestre".

Page 149: Add "and Hogarth" to "Agrimson".

Page 149: Add "et al." to "Dall'Aglia (2019)".

Across the entire document:

The notation of genes must be done by writing their names in italics.



Signature: _____

Print name: Pedro González Redondo

Please review the attached evaluation guidelines and provide your assessment below.

Criteria	Grade	Descriptive Anchors
Research Question/Set-up	<u>A</u>	Includes clear description of the issue, identifies gaps in scientific knowledge and/or provides justification for the current research study.
	B	Research questions clearly articulated and sufficient background information included.
	C	Lacks a focused research question and importance is not completely justified.
Literature Review	<u>A</u>	Identifies relevant research and literature and accurately summarizes and integrates the information.
	B	Cites major works and places them in context.
	C	Fails to cite or assimilate previous works.
Methodology	<u>A</u>	Demonstrates clear understanding and proper use of methodology, identifies relevant strengths and weaknesses of methods used.
	B	Demonstrates proficient knowledge of methodology and gives justification for selection of methods.
	C	The methodology is not well appropriate for study and understanding is not clearly demonstrated.
Analysis/Presentation of Results	<u>A</u>	Results interpreted in light of proposed research question and existing literature. Includes alternative explanations and instructional tables and graphs.
	B	Results clearly summarized, discussion of results focused and tied to research question.
	C	Presentation lacks focus, tables are unorganized, and results produce no insight into proposed question.
Discussion/Implications	<u>A</u>	Clearly summarizes the key information gained from the study and describes advancement of knowledge or new insights on an issue.
	B	Discussion of results focused and connected to research questions. Implications for future research discussed.
	C	The new knowledge gained from the study and implications of the study are not clearly discussed.
Quality of Writing	<u>A</u>	Ideas expressed with very good clarity, logic, and conciseness.
	B	Coherent presentation with limited typos and grammatical errors. Logical progression of thought within overall thesis and within each section.
	C	Significant parts difficult to understand, numerous errors. Repetition, poor organization of ideas, and poor writing hinders reader understanding.