

The Authors presented a nice study focused on the problem of antimicrobial resistance in *Salmonella enterica* collected from farms in South Italy. This kind of regional data is of significant scientific value. The title is consistent with the subject of the manuscript. The appropriate methodology was applied. The whole manuscript has fitting composition. The conclusions are mostly supported by the results. However, some of the aspects of the manuscript need to be corrected:

- In the chapter “Introduction” there is a lot of very general information about antimicrobial resistance. In the reviewer’s opinion, the paragraph (lines: 34-47) should be more compressed.
- Also, in the “Introduction”, the Authors should elaborate on how frequently *Salmonella* isolates harbor antimicrobial resistance genes (AMR). It could underline the importance of the presented results.
- The sampling process in methodology was described too generally. How many samples were collected from each sample type and farm? How many samples were collected in total? This paragraph should be rearranged in order to present to the Readers full data on the sampling process and the range of performed surveys.
- Similarly, more information should be added to the description of the results, to establish the baseline of resistance occurrence. Based on the presented data it is impossible to evaluate the scale of antimicrobial resistance increase and its timeline.
- Line 113: “**Some** of **the** biological samples collected from the selected farms tested positive ~~to~~ **for** *Salmonella* spp.” – The Authors should use precise language when describing the results. How many biological samples were positive?
- The results of sensitivity tests and molecular biology are described very vaguely. Are the results obtained by both methods consistent with each other? The Authors should consider adding a table, that would summarize the results of resistance genes detection by PCR. Because no additional data is supporting the description in the text.
- Line 187-189 – The Authors should consider adding specific dates from cited publication, as time references for when the increase in antimicrobial resistance started to occur.
- Line 200-206 – The paragraph is a little disjointed from the article, there should stronger references to the results and research scope.
- In the Reviewer’s opinion, in the chapter “Discussion”, more focus should be put on discussing the results of resistance detection and its occurrence in South Italy and Europe, rather than the description of some of the resistance mechanisms. This deviates from the main scope of the manuscript.
- Conclusions should be more compact and to the point.