

Review of: "Biological Parenthood and Reproductive Technologies"

Tajudeen Noibi¹

¹ Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

On the abstract page no need for the parenthesis

- Most sentences of the sentes are right except that THE NEED FOR A SEMI COLON ON ITEM (ii) semi colon

Page 1 may be better rephrase

- A possible objection to the idea that reproductive technologies increase the opportunities for parenthood is that they only do so for a specific type of parenthood, namely biological parenthood [1][2][3][4][5][6]. However, we have shown above that there are strong reasons of justice to support expanding the access to parenthood in general². But it is not obvious that the same reasons of justice apply to expanding the access to biological parenthood - and this is what this article will argue.
- Page the later end of page 1 to page 2 may well introduce biological parenthood to usher in the sub-topic
- Page 2 to be better reshaped, using looking in the sentence is less formal and could here is another possible way to rephrase it:
- Before we examine the value of biological parenthood, let's briefly define what it means: the literature usually adopts a broad understanding of the 'biological' in biological parenthood, encompassing both genetic ties and gestational ties

PAGE 2 DISCOURSE COULD BE WELL EXPANDED MARGINALIZED GROUPS BEYOND LGBT SUCH AS

- People who cannot or do not want to have biological children, such as infertile couples, same-sex couples, transgender people, or childfree people, who may face stigma, discrimination, or lack of support for their reproductive choices.
- People who adopt or foster children, who may not be recognized as "real" parents by some biological parents or by society, and who may face legal, financial, or emotional challenges in raising their children.
- People who use assisted reproductive technologies (ART), such as in vitro fertilization (IVF), surrogacy, or sperm/egg donation, who may encounter ethical, social, or medical issues related to their methods of conception and parenthood.

Using see Ben Vincent (2020) Non-Binary Genders: Navigating Communities, Identities and Healthcare. Non-Binary lives (2020): An anthology of Intersecting Identities, Jessica Kingsley Jos Twist, Ben Vincent , Meg-John Bakers Jessica publishers,

- The paper is neither paper nor a theoretical discourse holding no data and review in nature, the researcher should further discourse and reclassify the preliminary and major discussion of the paper
- Page 2 avoid opinions or ethical position of the researcher as it demeans the objective position of the paper, try to lay out positions based such as paragraph 4page 2 “I don’t believe.....”
- No methodology
- Objective is not widely discoursed hence questions on the academic motive of the paper 1



Page 3- The style of writing does little to enrich the contributions of the author in a manner that shows the further development technologically aided planned parenthood and the growth of it vis via the redefinition of social binaries the further defines parenthood. Hence, makes a r review work, while having little property of one, it also has little empirical data to substantiate your findings.

Page 3-the style of writing is not applicable to a research publication. kindly revisit the recommended style of writing.

Page 3 and 4 - your upper-case headlines and subheadings are not applicable for article writing. The sub classification of sub themes must be applicable for article writing for ethic paper writing . Consider reclassifying your sub chapters.

On page 4, the emphasis on think is overused, think of repositioning the paper towards some empirical findings that would put clarity and evidence to the subjected claim by the researcher on 4page 4 and as a whole.

Try to avoid the too much use of inverted commas (see page 4 ‘replicating’ is the least serious and ‘entrenching’ the most serious. We could here do some “fancy”

Page 4 , The idea is actually pretty simple: patriarchy has been hijacking biology in ways that are relevant to how biological parenthood (or at least a preference for biological parenthood) replicates, reinforces and entrenches it (patriarchy, that is). Why? Because patriarchy has been using biology in order to keep women and girls down – and continues to do so. In fact, even a stronger version of this claim warrants consideration if not defense, namely the idea that patriarchy just *is* the use of biology to keep women and girls down.

However, if the intention is writing a sociological/ethical paper, the paper must state what style or research it embarks on.

The last paragraph on “Page 4 is not necessary-objectivism and lack of bias should always be the attribute of any intended paper - but some of the considerations for the former claim trickle down to the latter one, I believe. How has patriarchy been using biology to keep girls and women down? Are you kidding me? Do I really have to spell this out? Have you ever heard of gestation? Breastfeeding? The special bond between mother and” – it may be better

reshaped to fit.

The paper is largely assumed as an ethical paper, numbering items for discussion would not be necessary, rather itemized on paragraphs to align ideas, opinions should be substantiated with aligned readings in such a manner showing an accord or otherwise.

The discourse of the writer should be reflected on the build-up and submission made. This mention of the led argument is mentioned built, faulted or progressed.

Page 7-This was largely unseen. (i) biological parenthood; (ii) non-biological parenthood; (iii) non-parenthood is in fact more helpful, this well discussed but the rise of non-conventional parenthood, must be traced, historically and the socio-medical development in the phenomenon

Page 7- Gramsci quote could well be summarized.

Page 7- the methodology should have been gradually built from the inception of the work, rather than a footnote. While this may be further expanded in the footnote, it should not be left put from inception.

While the paper does have substance, for a better improvement of the paper, I will suggest you go through [er_15_guide_lo_res.pdf \(harvard.edu\)](#), this will further enrich the paper and give further guide to it

The submission is considered as strengthened with further guide as stated above.