

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_95584
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of the Golden Liquid from Honeybees and Refined Sugar on the Blood Glucose and Serum Iron Levels of Albino Rats
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajriz.com/index.php/AJRIZ/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The definition of the T5 Group is not described in the Study. The methodology does not describe at what time of the day and what is the period between the evaluations of the observed. I recommend not using adjectives, greater or lesser, as no significant differences were observed. The high variance observed in the mean values of the experimental variables denote high volatility and consequent departure from a so-called normal distribution, which is essential for the use of parametric hypothesis tests. yes yes yes needs adjustments recommended in the methodology yes yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rogério Ferreira Emygdio
Department, University & Country	ECEME, Brazil