



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The results are modest and they have impact about STEC in worldwide. Other information such as serotyping and phenotypic improve these results mainly on epidemiologic aspects. The authors did not performed any assay suggested.	Sincerely, I had started getting confused on the reviewer's comment "The authors did not performed any assay suggested". I went back and read through our methods, Results and Discussion. This is what we wrote: In the Material and Methods section pages , we had stated the following on lines 68 - 72: "This was then plated onto Sorbitol-Mac Conkey (SMAC) agar plates and incubated for 18 – 20 h at 37°C. Suspected pure colonies for <i>E. coli</i> were subcultured on Mac Conkey and blood agar plates. Colonies were confirmed as <i>E. coli</i> if they were lactose positive on Mac Conkey agar plates, and biochemical tests gave negative hydrogen sulphide production, positive indole and motility tests in agar SIM, positive beta-glucuronidase and methyl red, and negative results for citrate according to International Standard Organization laboratory protocols [ISO 16654: 2001]. Pure colonies from the blood agar were stored in brain heart infusion (BHI) with 5% glycerol in -20°C until further molecular tests". And in the section of Results and Discussion, we stated on lines 159 – 161 that "Specimens that yielded bacterial growth were confirmed as positive <i>E. coli</i> isolates if such organisms were lactose fermenting positive on MacConkey media, sulphur negative, indole and motility positive on SIM tests, and citrate and oxidase negative etc as given on Table 3. And it occurred to me that we did not give any data or result to indicate the phynotypic or conventional assay we performed. We have therefore included Table 3 in the write up. We still have to point out that we did not perform any serotyping assay using Enzyme Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA) test. The serotyping assay we performed was molecular looking for the genes, and we duly reported our findings. We would like to apologise for the oversight and also thank the reviewer for this meticulous review.