



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_8507
Title of the Manuscript:	Emerging third generation cephalosporin resistance and single RAPD primer for typing clinical Salmonella isolates from Lagos, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: 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	This manuscript deals with a morphotyping, biotyping, serotyping, antimicrobial susceptibility testing, and RAPD-PCR technique, to characterize the <i>Salmonella</i> sp isolates. PCR-based fingerprinting using random amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD) has been used widely for genome identification. However, please include more details in the method about the strategies to choose or to make the primers, since usually in other study the primers of RAPD constitute of more than 8 primers in order to get the highest discrimination index. The calculation of the discrimination index is lacking and the authors just report that the discrimination index was 0.77 (line 190). The discrimination index should be more than 0.9, in order to show the robustness of the method to differentiate of field-isolated <i>Salmonella</i> strains and epidemiological studies. In the material and methods section the authors do not mention if in this study use the reference <i>Salmonella typhi</i> strains, and does not use the dendrogram to show the genetic variation among isolates.	The robustness of the 09 index is acknowledge but 0.77 approximately 0.8 was obtained. Discrimination index was calculated using a discrimination power calculator http://insilico.ehu.es/mini_tools/discriminatory_power/
Minor REVISION comments	In my opinion the topic of this article is interesting and useful to optimise the drug use, especially third generation of cephalosporin. Please rewrite the article including references using SDI Paper template, or by using sequence numbers like 1., 1.1., 1.2., to organize the whole article and number the headings and subheadings. Please be consistent in writing of "bla ctx", "<i>bla</i>_{CTX}" genes (lines 162-168). I think the author should change the Figure 2, with better image resolution.	The article has been rewritten using SDI paper template and references cross-checked. blaCTX-M is now uniformly written.
Optional/General comments	Please clarify ethical issue, if any	Already clarified.