



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_24994
Title of the Manuscript:	Preparation of Fowl Typhoid Vaccine from Field Isolates and Determination of Efficacy
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>This study involved aspects of Microbiology and vacinology. The manuscript is well written and interesting and important for and Publics Health, although there are several suggestions to be done.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some of the keywords used do not follow any index descriptors in public health, as BIREME, MeSH, NLM or UMLS (eg. <i>Fowl typhoid</i> □) 2. There are several errors in the manuscript's organization. I suggest to separate the topics "Results" and "Discussion". I guess it's a little bit confuse. 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The "conclusions" must respond to the initial objectives. So I suggest that the conclusion at the end of the text must fully answer the questions asked in the objectives. 	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This article is well written.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Charbell Miguel Haddad Kury
Department, University & Country	Department of Pediatrics, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil