



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	1. Lns 20-21 (ABSTRACT) refer: “About 25% of the isolates were resistant to cefuroxime, ceftazidime and ceftriazone”, while Lns 149-150 (RESULTS AND DISCUSSION), as well as Table 2, refer that “The results of antimicrobial susceptibility tests revealed that 49% of the isolates were resistant to cefuroxime, 46% to cefoxitin, 37% to ceftriazone and 35% to ceftazidime” 2 Reference (8) is not referring to the biochemical tests described by Cowan and Steel. 3. Were faeces, blood and urine collected from all the 300 patients? • If so, were all examined culturally for <i>Salmonella</i> spp? In such a case the samples should be 900 OR • Only 300 fecal samples were tested for <i>Salmonella</i> spp? It should be made clear. 4. Please review again the numbering of the references, because many do not correspond to the numbers in the text.	Abstract modified. The reconciliation on the % figures clarified. References now cross-checked and complete. The number of samples is 300 which has been clarified. The number of the references now tallied with the ones in the text.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Ln 5: delete either ...study... or investigating.... Ln 14: "Three hundred..." add the word "samples". The term "serovar/serovars" should be used instead of "serotype/serotypes" throughout the text. Ln 17: "levofloxacin" instead of "laevofloxacin" is preferred Ln 24 and elsewhere in the text: the word "<i>Salmonella</i>" should be italicized throughout the text. Ln 32: "...for <u>the</u> treatment..." Ln 33: "<i>Salmonella</i> <u>spp.</u> Both in animals and humans" Ln 35: instead of "had emerged" "has currently emerged" Ln 39: "...and other <u>microorganisms</u> <u>has</u> been..." Ln 43: "concern" instead of "concerns" Ln 44: "salmonellae" instead of "<i>Salmonellae</i>" Ln 48: "...PCR <u>techniques</u>" Ln 51: "...analysis and Multilocus..." Ln 57: "...to investigate..." instead of "investigating" Ln 58: "identify" instead of "identifying" Ln 58: "methods" instead of "method"	All the grammartical , spellings and italics now addressed in the text one after the other.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Ln 63: the word “who” should be deleted. Ln 64: “...May 2012 <u>were investigated.</u>” Ln 68: “...of collection <u>and</u> stored...” Lns 71-72: the trademark of the solid media should also be provided Ln 77: “...antibiotics (cefotaxime 30ug,... etc,) by <u>the disk diffusion method</u>” The trademark of the antimicrobials should also be referred Lns 147, 188: “S.” should be italicized Ln 152: “...antibiotics are currently <u>the</u> drug of...” Ln 153: “salmonelloses” instead of “Salmonellosis” Ln 157: “Previous research has shown that...” instead of “Study had shown” Ln 165: “...genes, while...” Ln 320: “<u>ST</u>-S. Typhi,”	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The topic of the manuscript is quite interesting, but some shortcomings are noticed and should be corrected	