



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_48961
Title of the Manuscript:	Successfully treated case of Non-Typhoidal Salmonella Meningitis in an otherwise healthy 5 month old infant: A case report
Type of the Article	Case study

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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please show the evidence of bacterial culture and identification of the pan-sensitive Salmonella typhimurium 2. How many antibiotics have been used to test the sensitivity? 3. Please show the timeline of the case in figure 4. Specify the culture detail of CSF. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have the included the table which shows the antibiotics against which the organism was sensitive and the antibiotics that had been used to test the sensitivity. I cannot include the original report of the CSF culture in the article for ethical issues but I am sending it to you as an email attachment as a proof. I request you to please not to include in the manuscript. 2. Seven antibiotics were used to test sensitivity. 3. I have included the timeline of the case in the figure form. I cannot recall the exact dates on which events occur. Hence I have included from the day of admission to the hospital. 4. Shown in the table 1.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please make more detailed epidemiological investigation, which will be helpful for understanding the cause and to avoid it in the future. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. After thorough literature search I already included the reliable and available epidemiological information in the manuscript. Due to rarity of the case, the data and studies available on this topic are scarce and the most I could find were case reports. If you consider it necessary, then I could probably add some more epidemiological information but the sources are weak, also it would unnecessarily prolong the manuscript in my opinion.
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please improve the writing of the whole manuscript, make it more constructive in reading. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thank you for your feedback. Please can you please elaborate on this comment? I would be grateful if you identify at which places I need to make changes. Other reviewers have said, "The presentation was beautifully made, leaving no room for ambiguity." Therefore I am a little confused that is it really necessary to make the changes??

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	