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Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. Table 1. The discussion about data on table 1 in the 2nd paragraph in page 15 is not appropriate. The table 1 should be deleted as suggested previously.

2. Figure 2. This is a new figure, and it should be deleted. However, the curve describing the total number of cases visited ER can be added to the current Figure 1. The number of these cases can be shown on the secondary Y-axis. In addition, the bars describing the cases of acute gastroenteritis can be shown from June 16 to August 7.

3. Figure 3. The molecular weights of the markers are still at the wrong positions. Their adjustment is difficult because the bands of the marker are hardly visible. Therefore, they should be removed from the gel picture.

4. The manuscript is lengthy, longer that the first version, and does not contain much new. I fully agree with another reviewer who stated that the authors should shorten the manuscript.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Abstract
   1.1. The complete name of Salmonella should be introduced when the name of a serovar is mentioned for the first time.
   1.2. “Stool and blood sample were isolated...” should be corrected to be “Stool and blood samples were collected...”
   1.3. Small initial letter for serovar should be used in the middle of the sentence.
   1.4. The mentioning “All S. Enteritidis isolates were of serogroup D...” should be removed because, by definition, the Enteritidis strains always belong to the group D, as already previously stated to the authors.

2. Epidemiological investigation
   By “These isolates were further...” the authors probably mean “These specimens were further...”

3. Bacterial strains
   It is unclear what the authors mean when they say that “..., two were of serogroup O9 group B and
four were . . .” Namely, the major antigenic determinant in group B is O4, not O9.

4. Most of the references still contain names of bacteria and should be written in italics.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No