



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BMRJ/2896
Title of the Manuscript:	Biodiversity and enterotoxigenic potential of staphylococci isolated from raw and spontaneously fermented camel milk.

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 9 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 This manuscript shows molecular characterization and enterotoxigenicity of staphylococci isolated from raw and spontaneously fermented camel milk. It can be published in British Microbiology Research Journal because it increases knowledge about the worldwide distribution of this pathogen. Nevertheless some points should be better discussed. Comments follow:	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	1. Why authors considered the following species (<i>Aerococcus viridans</i>, <i>Dermacoccus nishinomiyaensis</i> and <i>Macroccoccus caseolyticus</i>) as CNS even these are different genera and are not related to <i>Staphylococcus</i> genus. 2. didn't mention about accession numbers of Partial sequencing of the <i>rpoB</i> in genBank??? Why? If you don't mention these accession numbers so no need to talk about Partial sequencing of the <i>rpoB</i> and need to re-edit the related parts. 3. Genus specific PCR (Martineau et al., 2001), is specific for genus <i>Staphylococcus</i> so how did you differentiate between <i>Staphylococcus</i>, <i>Macroccoccus</i>, <i>Aerococcus</i> and <i>Dermacoccus</i> using these genus specific primers targeting the <i>tuf</i> gene. (mentioned in methodology)	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1 - How did authors know that reports are limited about diversity, genotypic and phenotypic characteristics of both CNS and CPS in milk and milk products, what is their references specially CPS. (this may be true in camel milk product but not in general) or add reference for this. 2. What is the number of milk? * in abstract: Staphylococci isolated from 59 raw and spontaneously fermented	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	* 2.1 Camel milk sample collection: Total of 105 samples of raw, fermenting or fully fermented 3. Authors didn't mention number of milk from each country (Kenya and Somalia) and prevalence of infection by these pathogens in each country 4. 2.3 Phenotyping and genotyping of staphylococci: here in this part of manuscript, the authors used molecular techniques to detect certain genes but didn't use biochemical tests or detect phenotypic or morphological features,so need to change the title of this part? 5. In case of numeration of bacterial samples, what is the time between collection and numeration and during that what is the temperature that samples stored directly after collection, and did time of storage has an effect on numeration? May be large number of bacteria/ml due to poor transportation, storage etc... of the milk samples? 6. As for the English, some words are misspelled and some sentences are poorly-written As: -camel milk (suusac) samples from collected in dstaphylococcal -235 BP-medium isolatesisolates? - is it <i>Aerococcus viridians</i> or <i>Aerococcus viridans</i> - Write references well in text (35 37)? 7. some times it is difficult to differentiate between number of samples when it is written between brackets and references so it is better to show that by writing number of samples or n 8. Check all references in list and text 9. In Table 1: are these species identified morphologically (lets say by biochemical tests) or by molecular biological tests or both? 10. Didn't authors mention if they found combination between enterotoxin genes? 11. It is better to add in discussin that using molecular techniques, especially DNA amplification allows the detection of potentially enterotoxigenic isolates based on the	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	gene sequences whether these strains expressed their toxin genes or not	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. - Use Gram reaction instead of gram reaction 2. The authors didn't mention member of herds covered in this study in each country.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ghaleb Adwan
Department, University & Country	Department of Biology and Biotechnology, An-Najah N. University, Palestine