



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correction of the title 2. <i>The reference to fish composition as aspects of fish quality is not right in my considered scientific opinion. However, the reference of pH and peroxide value variations with seasons as aspects of fish quality is scientifically correct. So, if the authors can do that in the document, discussions by restricting quality to those 2 parameters, then that is scientifically sound.</i> 3. <i>The reference to fish safety is not necessary because peroxide values and pH are not good determinants of food quality. Fish quality aspects should not be discussed in the document at all. They should be avoided in my opinion.</i> 4. <i>I advise the authors to do grammar check of the text as there are considerable errors of grammar in the article.</i> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title is corrected as per the reviewer's suggestion. 2. The abstract is rewritten as per the suggestions given. 3. Introduction as well as review part has been upgraded as per the suggestions. 4. References to fish quality for the specific fish species and seasonal variations are not available, but we have used only those references that correlate with the species and also show some seasonal variations. As per the reviewer's opinion we have removed other parameters from the manuscript. 5. Fish quality parameters are removed from the manuscript as per the reviewer's opinion. 6. The manuscript is checked for grammatical errors. 7. The references are rechecked and corrected as per the journal's style.