

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	SouthAsianResearch.JournalofNaturalProducts
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_SARJNP_129447
TitleoftheManuscript:	ViscosityofRawandBoiledHoneyfromTaboraTanzaniaatConstantandVariableTemperatures.
TypeoftheArticle	Originalresearcharticle

GeneralguidelinesforthePeerReviewprocess:

Thisjournal'speerreviewpolycystateshat**NO**manuscriptshouldberejectedonlyonthebasisof'**lacko fNovelty**', providedthemanuscriptisscientificallyrobustandtechnically sound.Toknowthecompleteguidelinesfor thePeerReviewprocess,reviewersarerequestedtovisitthislink:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

ImportantPoliciesRegardingPeerReview

PeerreviewCommentsApprovalPolicy:<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>Benefitsfor Reviewers:<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

ReviewForm3

PART1: Comments

	Reviewer'scomment	Author'sFeedback(Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpart inthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedback here)
Pleasewritea fewsentencesregardingtheimportance ofthismanuscriptfor thescientificcommunity.A minimumof3-4sentencesmayberequiredforthis part.	Thismanuscriptaddressesanimportantaspectof honeyanalysisbyexploringtheviscositypropertiesofrawand boiledhoney,contributingtothe scientificunderstandingofhoney'srheologicalbehavior.However,the study lacksclarityregardingthe specifichoneysamplesusedandfailstoprovideadequatestatisticalanalysisto support theinterpretationand conclusionsdrawn.	
Isthethitleofthearticlesuitable? (Ifnotpleasesuggestanalternativetitle)	Titleisnotclear Forclaritythetitlecanbechangedto-ImpactofTemperatureontheViscosityof RawandBoiledHoneyfrom Tabora,Tanzania	DONE
Istheabstractofthearticlecomprehensive?Doyou suggesttheadition(ordeletion)of somepointsinthis section?Pleasewriteyoursuggestionshere.	Theabstractdoesnotfullyadheretotheexpectedformat.Theabstractdoesnotfullyadheretotheexpected scientificformat.Itrequiresacompleterevision,asthewritingstyleand approachreflectasignificantgapin understandingscientificwritingprinciples.	IMPROVED
Isthemanuscriptscientifically,correct?Pleasewrite here.	Themanuscriptis notscientificallywell-designed.Itfollowsa formatmoresuitedtoa dissertationreportrather thana scholarlyscientificpaper.Keyareassuchasmethodology,statisticalanalysis,anddiscussionrequire significantimprovementtomeetthe standardsexpectedinscientificresearch.Additionally,clarity,precision,and	IMPROVED
Arethereferencesufficientandrecent?If youhave suggestionsofadditionalreferences,pleasement ion theminthereviewform.	Themanuscriptlackssufficientreferencetorecentscientificarticles.Incorporatingup-to-dateresearchinthe introduction,methodology,anddiscussionsectionswillenhancethemanuscript'sscientificrigorandprovidea strongertheoreticalfoundation.Thiswillhelpensurethefindingsare supportedbyrelevantandcurrentliterature,	IMPROVED
Isthelanguage/Englishqualityofthearticlesuitable forscholarlycommunications?	Thelanguageandgrammarofthearticlerequiresignificantrevision.The currenttextcontainsnumerous grammaticalelerrorsandinconsistencies,whichaffecttheclarityandreadabilityofthemanuscript.Athorough proofreadingandeditingprocessisnecessarytoensurethelanguageissuitablefor	IMPROVED
Optional/Generalcomments	The manuscript does not comply with the journal's format and structure. Additionally, the study conducted is too basic, lacking and relevance to current scientific advancements. Improvements are needed to align with the journal's expectations and ensure the research addresses a more meaningfuland impactful topic within the scientific community.	IMPROVED

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	NIL