



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	With the methodology used in this study one cannot achieve the objective. The objectives/aims also vary in different parts of the paper : Line 75 "... to investigate the effectiveness of medication..."; Line 76 "... to study the seroprevalence of..."; Line 180 "...to assess the prevalence of Salmonella..."; Line 181 "... to detect potential sources of contamination..." How could the researchers take infection of the chickens with Salmonella for granted? Were the chicken artificially or naturally infected? Such an experiment is best performed with an artificial infection. Natural infection with Salmonella in chickens is not that common and not granted. The types of tissue samples collected are not indicated in the materials and methods. Only cloacal swab samples were mentioned. Line 102 "... 25g of each type of specimen..." I doubt whether the most important tissue samples for Salmonella in chickens weigh 25 g. Line 87...for 5 days... When? The 1st 5 days of life, at the middle, at the end? All the drugs are mentioned in their brand names- Brand names should come next to generic names and the manufactures need to be indicated. The technique claimed to be used for serological typing is incorrect. Serotyping for Salmonella is usually done in reference laboratories. If the authors	The objectives/aims were fixed. Chicken were artificially infected with <i>Salmonella</i> Typhimurium. The types of tissue samples collected were added to the section of Materials and Methods. Line 102 was a typographical error and corrected. Line 87 The antibiotics were administered for 5 days in all three cases at week six coinciding with a single dose of a wild-type multiresistant strain of <i>Salmonella</i> Typhimurium. Brand names should come next to generic names example Norfloxacin (Menorox). Trisulvitrim (no generic name found) is a trade mark of a Canadian company (Vétoquinol N.A. Inc.) and Neomycin is the Neochlore. The serotyping was done in a <i>Salmonella</i> reference laboratory, Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Medical Sciences, The University of the West



SDI Review Form 1.6

	mean serogrouping then they have to still correctly state the procedure. “O” and “H” antisera are not used together for serogrouping; they are used separately. If serotyping was used, what was/were the serotypes of <i>Salmonella</i> isolated? The result is present at an animal level only. The paper doesn’t show which samples were positive. There is no statistical comparison between the different groups. Why? Is it because the number of infected chickens in some groups too small?	Indies. “O” and “H” antisera were not used together for serogrouping; they were used separately. <i>Salmonella</i> Typhimurium was isolated since chicks were artificially infected. No other serovar was isolated. Post-mortem specimens including caeca and crops showed the presence of <i>Salmonella</i> in 1.6 % (1/60) each of chickens treated with Menorox, and Neochlore, compared to 23 % (14/60) among the control group. No infection was demonstrated in chicks treated with Trisulvitrim. This was a prevalence study and it was compared in the 3 groups of infected chickens and the control and noted that Trisulvitrim was the most effective antibiotic.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	“effectiveness of medication” Which medication, it needs to be explicit: antimicrobial, antibiotic, anticoccidial....? Line 48 ... good hygiene...” the work doesn’t include hygiene- no data is presented regarding hygiene Line 99 and 102 which pre-enrichment broth? Line 106: 0.5 ml is too much for plating Line 107 “...such as...” this is not the way how materials and methods is written. You have to exactly show which techniques, in this case, media you used. The identification of Salmonella is not sufficiently discussed: All non-lactose fermenters are not candidates for biochemical test.	The medications used were antibiotics as referred above. Line 48 Good hygiene was deleted. Line 99 and 102: buffered peptone water 1%. Line 106. It was a typographical error and fixed. Line 107. It was fixed. The identification of <i>Salmonella</i> was discussed.
Optional/General comments	The study area and the study period were not described. The study animals were not also well described. There are also some typographical errors in the document.	The study area, the study period and animals were better described. Typographical errors in the document were addressed.