

**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	Original research 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 '**l a c k o f N o v e l t y**', 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

	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</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 addresses an important aspect of honey analysis by exploring the viscosity properties of raw and boiled honey, contributing to the scientific understanding of honey’s rheological behavior. However, the study lacks clarity regarding the specific honey samples used and fails to provide adequate statistical analysis to support the interpretation and conclusions drawn.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>Title is not clear</b> For clarity the title can be changed to-Impact of Temperature on the Viscosity of Raw and Boiled Honey from Tabora, Tanzania	
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 does not fully adhere to the expected format. The abstract does not fully adhere to the expected scientific format. It requires a complete revision, as the writing style and approach reflect a significant gap in understanding scientific writing principles.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is not scientifically well-designed. It follows a format more suited to a dissertation report rather than a scholarly scientific paper. Key areas such as methodology, statistical analysis, and discussion require significant improvement to meet the standards expected in scientific research. Additionally, clarity, precision, and appropriate structure are essential for ensuring the manuscript's	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript lacks sufficient reference to recent scientific articles. Incorporating up-to-date research in the introduction, methodology, and discussion sections will enhance the manuscript's scientific rigor and provide a stronger theoretical foundation. This will help ensure the findings are supported by relevant and current literature,	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and grammar of the article require significant revision. The current text contains numerous grammatical errors and inconsistencies, which affect the clarity and readability of the manuscript. A thorough proofreading and editing process is necessary to ensure the language is	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	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 meaningful and impactful topic within the scientific community.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vinutha R Bhatta
Department, University & Country	Jyoti Nivas College Autonomous, Bengaluru City University, India