

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_129447
Title of the Manuscript:	Viscosity of Raw and Boiled Honey from Tabora Tanzania at Constant and Variable Temperatures.
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

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

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The research is scientifically very weak, and the title is scientifically poor. The study lacks scientific enrichment as it only addresses one criterion, which is the estimation of viscosity 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 allocated for the methods and other sections. Note: This is not scientific research, so I did not put any notes in the text.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dhia Ibrahim Jerro Al-Bedrani</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al-Qasim green university, Iraq</b>