



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</u>
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_AJEA_4109
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MEDICATION IN THE PREVENTION OF SALMONELLA IN GROWING CHICKENS AND THE SEROPREVALENCE OF ANTI-SALMONELLA ANTIBODIES IN BIRDS.
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<i>Salmonella enterica</i> is recognized as one of the most common bacterial causes of foodborne diarrheal illness worldwide. <i>Salmonella</i> spp. widely distributed in nature and food animals are the main reservoir for human infections. The manuscript under review describes the efficacy of drug's treatment to prevent chicken <i>Salmonella</i> Typhimurium infections. The authors compared the effectiveness of three agents (Trislvitrim, Menorox and Neochlore) and found that the Trisulvitrim is the most effective. The manuscript lacks some important information. The authors should give more detailed data about active components of the used agents and provide data about the previous use of the tested agents in poultry industry. I think that the tested drugs have been used many times. Thus, although the manuscript raises an important medical issues it does not provide essential new information – see conclusions of the paper.	More detailed data about active components of the used agents was provided. We found very no information about the use of these antibiotics in chickens or poultry industry.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I have observed that the most of the references in the paper are quite old; this specially applies to the epidemiological data. The authors should include newer relevant references in the manuscript. The manuscript also needs some editorial	The authors included newer relevant references in the manuscript. Editorial corrections: some grammatical, stylistic and factual errors were corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	corrections as it contains some grammatical, stylistic and factual errors. Some examples are given below: - Materials and methods – generally, this part of the text requires some stylistic corrections. - Line 203 – should be the most - Line 30 – Salmonella should be corrected into <i>Salmonella</i> - Line 31 – Serological should be corrected into serological - Line 38 – Salmonellosis should be corrected to salmonellosis - Line 44 – please explain the expression “natural immunity” - Line 124 – please explain the expression “normal saline”	Some examples are given below: - Materials and methods –Some stylistic corrections were done. - Line 203 – It was corrected - Line 30 – It was corrected - Line 31 – It was corrected - Line 38 – It Was corrected - Line 44 – It was - Line 124 – Physiological normal saline solution 0.9%, it was corrected in the text.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors should provide information whether the observed differences of the <i>Salmonella</i> prevalence between three bird groups and the differences of the seroprevalence of anti-<i>Salmonella</i> antibodies in various avian species are statistically significant.	That information was provided (differences about Salmonella prevalence). The study of the sero-prevalence of antibodies was excised from the manuscript and all authors agreed.