



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_50805
Title of the Manuscript:	Trends in epidemiology, susceptibility pattern and serotypes of Salmonellae at a tertiary care hospital: An eight year study
Type of the Article	Original 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lines 3-4: Edit title to reflect specific study setting and review period, e.g. ....at a tertiary hospital in country xxx: 2011 – 2018</li> <li>2. Clarify specimen types from which isolates were obtained for this study: Abstract refers to blood and stool (line 12), methods section refers to blood, stool, urine and pus (line 51), while results section refers to blood, stool and pus (Lines 62-63)</li> <li>3. Briefly spell-out the recommended antibiotics for setting DST for Salmonella as per the CLSI guidelines, in the methods section. This provides a quick guidance to the expectations in the results</li> <li>4. Line 54: Move test trade name to immediately after the “antisera”</li> <li>5. Line 59: Expound on data analysis section to provide more context on data analysis was done to arrive at the stated results</li> <li>6. Line 63-64:As salmonella is known to be a burden among the under-five population, including age distribution of the affected population would further categorize the burden of disease</li> <li>7. Line 79: Specify the third generation cephalosporin used in the Key. If they are more than 1, include the specific third generation cephalosporins used in the narrative</li> <li>8. Line 125: Specify where else ampicillin has been used to justify your statement</li> <li>9. Lines 133-134: Provide citation/ reference for the statement</li> <li>10. Line 136: Replace the word diminished with low as 2011 and 2012 were at the beginning of the review period</li> <li>11. Lines 140-143: Add more discussion on the observed serotypes in the study</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Include key words on the cover page for the manuscript, if they were not taken out for purposes of the review</li> <li>2. Write scientific names properly throughout the manuscript e.g Lines 9, 18, 20, 21, ...</li> <li>3. Line 78: Use proper (scientific writing) formatting for Table 1</li> <li>4. Line 61-63: Distribution of isolates by specimen type could be better presented in form of a pie-chart</li> <li>5. Follow journal citation style where citations are made throughout the manuscript, especially where names are cited, e.g lines 105, 123</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>This is a good study documenting valuable findings that contribute to the antimicrobial resistance knowledge base and therefore have the ability to offer evidence-based guidance on interventions to monitor and mitigate AMR in this setting and similar settings. To further strengthen the manuscript, the following need to be considered</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The grammar and punctuation throughout the paper needs to be reviewed. The paper will greatly benefit from review by an expert or fluent at the English language</li> <li>b. If typhoid is a public health concern in India as stated in the manuscript, having 52 isolates of Salmonella over an 8 year period in a tertiary hospital does not seem to speak to this. Adding context on the catchment population of the facility, annual and overall (8 years) consultations and consultations presenting with fever at the facility will improve the relevance of this study. Additionally, presenting the 52 as a proportion of the total consultations with fever over the 8 year period would classify the burden of typhoid in India and therefore provide more justification for the study</li> <li>c. It is of paramount importance to include information on quality control of the study, especially in selecting the isolates to be included in the study, conducting susceptibility testing, to provide assurance of the quality of the study and therefore improve confidence in the findings. Stating that CLSI guidelines were used is not</li> </ol>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>enough. Include information on QC strains used, for example and the results obtained. Also, include information on any isolates not included or excluded from the study for any reasons for example undermined integrity due to poor preservation/ storage, inadequate identifying information, among others</p> <p>d. Data re-analysis to include confidence intervals and/or p-values would greatly improve the statistical significance of the findings presented, as well as the inference made in drawing conclusions.</p> <p>e. Results should be presented and discussed in a systematic order to minimize confusing the reader, ie, start from etiology, serotypes and then susceptibility pattern</p>	
--	---	--

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Victoria Katawera</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Liberia</b>