



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_28207
Title of the Manuscript:	Shiga toxin Producing Escherichia coli (STEC) in Food Producing Animals from Trinidad and Tobago
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

	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. The results of this study are very modest and they do not contribute with matter of bovine STEC. 2. The references of Introduction section are olds. 3. If study is about STEC (stx1 and stx2), the authors should be performed the SUBTYPES mainly stx2 (epidemiologic importance). 4. The figure 1 is very bad. This figure missed several details. 5. Serotyping is important performed "H" antigen. This study was performed only SEROGROUP. The authors should be complete serotyping (O:H) for epidemiologic data. 6. And "gene expressions". Only PCR without PHENOTYPIC assays is not very important. The authors should be performed the citotoxicity assays with Vero cells (shiga-toxin) because the strains can have gene but without expression.	1. We want to really thank the review for making out time to go through our paper. We do agree with the reviewer that our results are modest but fortunately, this is the first time such a study is carried out in our area. It will definitely encourage future elaborate studies. 2. We have completely revised the references and have tried as much as we can to use references that are published in the past 5 to 10 years. 3. The scope of this first study was mainly focused on the shiga toxins 1 and 2 genes. Perhaps in future studies and as we are able to source funds we will seek to expand the study to other subtypes of the stx2. 4. Unfortunately that was the best of our figures and since the quality was poor, we have humbly deleted it. 5. We are happy the reviewer pointed this out. Unfortunately we could not perform the serotyping because of financial constraints. We hope to include this in any future studies. 6. Again we do agree with the reviewer that E. coli "strains can have gene but without expression". But we wanted to tart from somewhere
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		