



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>In my opinion the manuscript still needs improvement.</p> <p>Part of the discussion should be moved to the Results section. And Figures legends must be more informative.</p> <p>There is lack of information how many samples of each fish species were collected for the analysis - without this information is hard to evaluate the statistics.</p> <p>Mass of the wet sample/inhomogenous sample for crude protein analysis should be 2,5-5 g.</p>	<p>Ok, thanks.</p> <p>Done.</p> <p>As indicated in the methodology, five different fish species were each purchased from four different markets, that means 20 samples were analysed. i.e. Hake (<i>Merluccius merluccius</i>) was purchased from four different markets same with the other four fish species.</p> <p>The crude protein analysis of the fish samples were all determined based on the experimental protocols described by Association of Official's Analytical Chemists (AOAC, 2000).</p>