

Comments

If data on traditional processing of given fish species are lacking, it might be worthwhile to consider publishing the current results. However, a major revision of the MS will then be needed. I will not go into all details at this stage, but rather, I will indicate some major issues that the authors should address. They are:

- End of '**Introduction**' section: Clearly state the goals of your research

Material and methods:

- More details needed on fish sampling, for example: what stunning method, fish weight, time post mortem before processing, etc. How many fish? What do you mean by 'fish samples', different from whole gutted fish? State: salt (NaCl?) quality grade, temperature and time for ALL three processing methods, what generated smoke (wood...), etc
- Sampling for TVC: Samples from where on the fish? With, or without skin? Concentrations, purity, manufacturer of chemicals.
- TVN: what is N1 and N2?, Type of spectrometer? Check all details (purities, weights, volumes etc) of chemicals
- Trace metals: check as above
- 'Statistics' section is missing

Results and discussion:

- *Organoleptic assessment* – Fig. 1 is same as time 0 in Figs 2 & 3? If yes, delete Fig.1.
All figures: align numbers and ticks! Figures and discussion: add SD (or SEM) to data points and state N (number of fish) and storage conditions in figure texts. Are the treatments really different ($p < 0.05$)? Adjust your discussion according to this! Check your references and what you state as being lean and fatty fish!!! Have you actually measured total fat content of the current species? Adjust text accordingly. Compare what you are saying about sensory quality, figures (range 8-15 end points) versus your 15 point hedonic scale. This makes no sense!
- *TVC*: What do you actually intend to show in Fig.4? Comparison with fresh fish, when, under what conditions...? Figures, statistics and discussion, see previous comments
- *Trace metals*: check you statements regarding 'no significant differences ($p < 0.05$)' versus 'higher or lower' values...

Conclusions:

- Adjust conclusions to discussion section after considering comments above.
Any significant differences among treatments ($p < 0.05$)?
- **References:** Nine missing or conflicting references (alphabetical order...)