

Review Form 3

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| JournalName: | SouthAsianResearchJournalofNaturalProducts |
| ManuscriptNumber: | Ms_SARJNP_129447 |
| TitleoftheManuscript: | ViscosityofRawandBoiledHoneyfromTaboraTanzaniaatConstantandVariableTemperatures. |
| TypeoftheArticle | |

GeneralguidelinesforthePeerReviewprocess:

Thisjournal'speerreviewpolycystatesthat **NO**manuscriptshouldberejectedonlyonthe basisof'**lackofNovelty**',providedthe manuscriptis scientificallyrobustandtechnicallysound.
To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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

ImportantPoliciesRegardingPeerReview

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

Review Form 3

PART1:Comments

| | Reviewer'scomment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part inthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedback here)</i> |
|--|--|--|
| Pleasewriteafewsentencesregardingtheimportance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | Theresearchisscientificallyveryweak,andthetitleisscientificallypoor.Thestudy lacks scientificenrichmentasitonlyaddressesonecriterion,whichistheestimationofviscosity in two cases: the first without using thermal treatment and the second with thermal treatment at different temperatures. Additionally, the scientific citations in the results and discussion were insufficient. From an organizational perspective, it does not qualify as scientific research by the known standards of proper scientific research, as it lacks a proper abstract, keywords, and a clear introduction separated from the methods. Furthermore, it did not provide the results with sufficient space or scientific value compared to the space allocatedforthemethodsandothersections. Note:Thisisnotscientificresearch,soldidnotputanynotesinthe text. | I RESPECT THE REVIEWERS VIEWS AND HAVE TRIED TO IMPROVEE |
| Isthethetitleofthearticlesuitable? (Ifnotpleasesuggestanalternativetitle) | No | I RESPECT THE REVIEWERS VIEWS AND HAVE TRIED TO IMPROVEE |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggesttheaddition(ordeletion)ofsomepointsinth is section? Please write your suggestions here. | No | I RESPECT THE REVIEWERS VIEWS AND HAVE TRIED TO IMPROVEE |
| Isthemanuscriptscientifically,correct?Pleasewrit e here. | No | I RESPECT THE REVIEWERS VIEWS AND HAVE TRIED TO IMPROVEE |
| Arethereferencesufficientandrecent?Ifyouhave suggestions of additional references, please mention theminthereviewform. | No | I RESPECT THE REVIEWERS VIEWS AND HAVE TRIED TO IMPROVEE |
| Isthelanguage/Englishqualityofthearticlesuitable for scholarly communications? | Yes | THANKS |

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(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)</i> |
|---|--|--|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |