



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_38538
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial susceptibility profiles and molecular Characterization of Salmonella isolated from fecal matter of Cattle in Chiang Mai, Thailand and their relatedness to human Salmonella isolates
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	i. Line 86: Kindly explain the rationale for obtaining 150 faecal samples and 110 blood samples since your calculated sample size using the stated formula was 78. ii. Kindly answer the following questions regarding Fig 1: 1. You mean <i>S. Typhimurium</i>, <i>S. Enteritidis</i> and <i>S. Weltevreden</i> have the same base pairs? 2. You claimed to identify 34 <i>Salmonellae</i> isolates but here the result showed only six isolates. Where are the rest? 3. The result is similar to the one published in https://tdtmvjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s40794-016-0045-6 . Do you have any explanation to that? iii. Line 205: Here, the author(s) claimed in the first sentence that “resistance was identified in all the isolate.” Subsequently however, author(s) reported that “the isolates were mostly susceptible.” How do justify these contradictions? iv. The result in Table 1 (Line 211) is not properly presented. The result should indicate the antibiotics tested and the number of resistant isolates. Plagiarism issue: YES. Plagiarism suspected. https://tdtmvjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s40794-016-0045-6	We thank the reviewer for the comments. i. Based on statistical principle, increased sample size provides more confidence level. ii. 1. Yes. 2. The figure demonstrated PCR pattern for positive samples. We did not show all results. We have modified figure legend accordingly. 3. The presentation of gel picture is similar to the manuscript you mentioned but the result was obtained from our laboratory. iii. We have corrected the text as the highlighted. IV. We have modified. Plagiarism issue: We followed the instruction how to perform the testing with slightly modification from the study mentioned. To avoid of plagiarism; we have modified the text to “PCR was performed as described previously (21). Except for 25 µl of Quick Taq HS DyeMix (TOYOBO, Japan), 18 µl of nuclease free water, 1 µl of each primer and 5 µl of extracted DNA were used. Forward and reverse PCR primers were synthesized by Bio Basic Inc., Canada.” Moreover, our study was performed in Thailand and the result is quite different.
Minor REVISION comments	i. The abstract should not be more than 300 words. Also the abstract should follow the format: Aims; Study design; Place and duration; Methodology; Results; Conclusion. ii. Throughout the manuscript, citations should come before the ‘Full Stop’ mark. iii. Correct the sentence beginning in line 62. iv. Line 74: The heading should read “Sample Collection” v. Irregular font size/style. Compare lines 118-129, 113-163, 174-183 etc. with the rest of the text. vi. Line 153: Correct the spelling of <i>Escherichia coli</i>. vii. Correct the sentence beginning in line 273. viii. Line 350: Delete one “25”.	We have modified as recommended.
Optional/General comments	Author(s) did not strictly follow guidelines in text formatting. Authenticity of the work is in doubt. A link with similar content is provided.	We have revised and followed VANCOUVER reference style.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>