



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Biotechnology Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BBJ_27867
Title of the Manuscript:	OPTIMIZING SALTING AND IMMERSION TIME IN LIQUID SMOKE OF FARMED GILTHEAD SEA BREAM (SPARUS AURATA) FILLETS USING RESPONSE SURFACE METHODOLOGY
Type of the Article	Original 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 should follow the Author's Guideline Instruction – Please, check the follow commentaries. - Check in all text the space between words (some words and final of paragraphs are together); - For all citations into the text, please use [] instead () – follow the Author's Guideline Instruction. Page 2, line 45 Instead “VASILIADOU et al.(2005) (3)” should be “VASILIADOU et al. [3]” – it's not necessary to use the year of publication – please check in all text and change it. Page 2, line 50 Instead “polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons” should be “Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)” Page 2, line 80 Instead “by hand” should be “manually” Page 3, lines 88-90 Instead “The immersion solution contained sodium chloride, sugar at concentration 20% (w/w) of sodium chloride content, the colorant E-102 at concentration 0.0070% (w/w) and 10% (w/w) of liquid smoke.” should be “The immersion solution contained 20% (w/w) of commercial saccharose, 20% (w/w) of sodium chloride, 0.0070% (w/w) of colorant E-102 and 10% (w/w) of liquid smoke.” Page 5, line 158	-Corrected -Corrected -Corrected -corrected line 50 -corrected line 80 -corrected 88-90 - The description of the scales is introduced in lines 164-169



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Instead “<i>sensory scales described by (3).</i>” should be “<i>sensory scales described by Vasiliadou et al. [3]</i>” It’s not clear in this section, which sensory test the authors used - Even the authors have followed a methodology cited by another author, the type of sensory test should be cited here. Page 6, Table 2 The authors must reorganize the layout of table – the presentation of the results is a bit confusing - Page 12 The authors should improve the item 3.3 Numerical Optimization – include the significance of the results presented in Table 3. It is not clear (i.e. output ??) Page 12 The authors should improve the item 3.4 Verification of the model – idem to the previous comment Page 14 The authors should improve the item 3.5 Proximate composition and sensory assessment of smoked gilthead seabream – lack of description and discussion of results Page 14 The References should be improved accordingly to the Author's Guideline Instructions	-The table 2 is split into two tables 2 and 3 pages 6 and 7. The paragraphs 3.3 (Numerical optimization) is merged with paragraph 3.4 (Verification of the model” and both are further discussed. Pages 13-14. As above The results were further discussed. - Corrected Pages 18-16
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		