

Editor's comments:

This is a primitive study and the manuscript has some fundamental defects, mainly in the materials and methods:

1. Lines 68-72: The authors mentioned that "...*Salmonella* isolates (119) from 96 blood and 23 stool specimens of patients... over a period of 3 years (2006 – 2009) were obtained". But they did not give any information about the sampling, isolation, and reservation of the isolates. If these isolates were offered by someone or some institute, the donator should be mentioned, and the cultural conditions should be mentioned for activating the bacteria and for checking the purity. The isolate code should be reported, not only a species name.
2. Line 75: The authors mentioned "The isolates which were previously identified and serotyped at the NICD were subcultured for morphological identification using standard microbiological methods", but they did not give any reference about the methods and results of the identification; no medium and conditions or reference are described for the subculture.
3. Lines 80 and 84: What are the meaning of ESBL and CLSI? A complete spelling should be given here since it is the first appearance.
4. Lines 81-83: Why the mentioned concentrations of the antibiotics were chosen?
5. Line 84: For the sentence "The reference method was micro-broth dilution according to CLSI standards for Gram negative bacteria", a reference is needed.
6. How the experiment was designed for the subsequent statistic analysis.

In general, a scientific publication should be reproducible and the methods should contain sufficient information for the readers, with this, the others can do a similar work, or repeat the same study for checking the results.

I strongly suggest the authors to make a sequencing analysis of 16S rRNA gene for some representative isolates of different species listed in Fig. 1.

Attached is the manuscript with some of my observations and changes.

Authors' feedback:

1. Information has been added that isolates were donated by National Institute of Communicable Diseases (NICD) and were originally collected for surveillance purposes from specimens of patients attending Nelson Mandela Academic Hospital Complex (NMAHC) and surrounding clinics, Eastern Cape, South Africa. The primary isolation were normally carried out at the various designated National Health Laboratory Services centres according to regions but centrally deposited at NICD, Johannesburg. The cultural conditions have been stated.
2. The microbiological methods, media and cultural conditions have been stated. The method used to previously or primarily identify and serotype at the NICD were those stipulated by the reference centre under the surveillance. Mention has been made on line 96 of the outcome of subculturing of the isolates
3. ESBL has been mentioned and defined in line 40 before line 80 or 84.
4. The concentrations of the antibiotics were predetermined by the manufacturer (Siemen Dade Behring) of the already made Combo panels to meet the Clinical laboratory Standards Institute Guideline.
5. The reference has been added.

6. Descriptive analysis was done using SPSS while Fisher's exact test of independence was used to compare susceptibility.