



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_41604
Title of the Manuscript:	Survival of Salmonella typhi in Brewed Pito Retailed in Accra
Type of the Article	Short 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	The authors describe (lines 72 – 76) that “A loopful of <i>Salmonella</i> isolate was suspended in 2ml of peptone water and 1ml inoculated into 9ml of fermented and unfermented pito respectively. Control samples (un-inoculated pito samples) were incubated alongside the test samples for an hour after which a loopful of each specimen was subcultured unto Salmonella-Shigella agar for 24 hours. This procedure was repeated on the pito samples for 5 consecutive days.” It is not clear if same inoculated sample was incubated for 5 days in total ans sampled each day or if the inoculation experiment was repeated on 5 consecutive days? – please clarify It is not defined with how many <i>Salmonella</i> spp. cells were pito samples inoculated (final concentration after dilution) and if it can be presumed that one loopful that was taken (define if 1 µl or 10 µl loop was used) for the analysis theoretically contains <i>Salmonella</i> spp. cells. – has to be clarified! Experimental design lacks positive control (e.g. <i>Salmonella</i> spp. cells inoculated in nutrient medium) that would allow to assess if the obtained results are real negatives or experimental artefacts. These issues need to be clarified before further comments/decisions on conclusions of this manuscript can be done.	The inoculation experiment was repeated on 5 consecutive days. This has been clarified in the manuscript now. We have indicated the loop size used for the study (line 76). The controls have been clearly spelt out now (lines 73 -82) The issues have been addressed in our new submission.
Minor REVISION comments	Use proper format for writing bacterial names throughout the manuscript, e.g. “<i>Salmonella typhi</i>” => either <i>S. Typhi</i> or <i>Salmonella enterica</i> ssp. <i>enterica</i> ser. <i>Typhi</i>! Also <i>Salmonella</i> spp. instead of <i>Salmonella spp.</i> (e.g. see line 18) Abstract: typing error in “experimental deign pattern” => should be “experimental design pattern” Line 58: lasts instead of last	Well noted. Corrections effected. Well noted and corrected. Well noted and corrected.
Optional/General comments		