

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
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	Research

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>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it comprehensively analyzes the viscosity of raw and boiled honey sourced from Tabora, Tanzania. Understanding the differences in viscosity between these two types of honey is crucial, as it can influence their applications in medical, industrial, and food processing sectors. The study employs established methods such as Stokes' law to ensure accurate results, contributing to the existing knowledge on honey's physicochemical properties. Furthermore, by addressing a research gap specific to the Tanzanian context, this work enhances local agricultural practices and informs global discussions on honey quality and its diverse uses.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is informative but can be improved for clarity and conciseness. Suggested Alternative Title "Comparative Analysis of Viscosity in Raw and Boiled Honey from Tabora, Tanzania at Varying Temperatures"	
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.	The abstract provides a good overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and significance. However, it could benefit from some refinements to enhance clarity and comprehensiveness. Suggestions for Improvement Clarify Objectives, Methodology Details, Highlight Key Findings, Conclude with Implications	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I noticed that several of the references cited in the manuscript are relatively old. To enhance the relevance and credibility of the research, I recommend updating the references to include more recent studies.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The overall quality of the language used in the manuscript requires improvement. There are several instances of grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and unclear sentences that may hinder the reader's understanding of the content.	
Optional/General comments	<p>This study provides a thorough examination of the viscosity of both raw and boiled honey, offering valuable insights into their physicochemical properties.</p> <p>1- The current title is informative but can be improved for clarity and conciseness. Suggested alternative: "Comparative Analysis of Viscosity in Raw and Boiled Honey from Tabora, Tanzania at Varying Temperatures."</p> <p>2- The abstract provides a good overview but could benefit from refinements to enhance clarity and comprehensiveness. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clarifying the objectives.• Providing more details on the methodology.• Highlighting key findings.• Concluding with the implications of the study. <p>3- Several references cited are relatively old. Updating them with more recent studies will enhance the relevance and credibility of the research.</p> <p>4- Language Quality: The overall quality of the language needs improvement. Addressing grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and unclear sentences will help in better conveying the study's content.</p>	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Parinaz Nezhad-Mokhtari
Department, University & Country	Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Iran