



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_BMRJ_18586
Title of the Manuscript:	Emerging Carbapenem Resistance in Salmonella Species from a Tertiary Hospital in Eastern Cape, South Africa
Type of the Article	Short Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- The number of blood and stool specimens should be indicated. Thus it will be clear that the researchers didn't isolate all that 119 <i>Salmonella</i> isolates just from a few specimen. -Isolation, identification and serotyping methods of <i>Salmonella</i> isolates should be noted in the article. (E.g. ISO 6579) -Antibiotic resistance patterns of <i>Salmonella</i> serovars should be indicated. In fig. 1, associating antibiotic resistance profiles with <i>Salmonella</i> serotypes can be quite revealing.	The corresponding numbers of 96 blood and 23 stool specimens have been specified in the manuscript. Isolates were obtained from a secondary source. Primary isolation, identification and serotyping of <i>Salmonella</i> isolates were carried at NHLS/NICD while isolate ID confirmation was done in this study as stated. Antibiotic resistance patterns of <i>Salmonella</i> serovars has been presented as Table 1
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		