

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_121018
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Evaluation of Physical and Phenolic Profiles in Propolis from N. Macedonian Regions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>I like this issues because [The study highlights significant variations in propolis extracts from the Pelagonia and Polog regions, impacting their physical parameters and bioactive content. Geographical origin influences propolis composition, affecting solubility, conductivity, and total phenolic content. Standardizing extraction protocols is essential to ensure consistent quality and maximize the medicinal potential of propolis. Further research should focus on identifying specific botanical sources and environmental factors contributing to regional variability. This understanding will enhance the strategic use of propolis in pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, and functional foods].</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Suitable</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Abstract is OK</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>I have made some changes in the material and methods subsections as seen in the manuscript below.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>According to the sequences that the author explains his point of view about his project from the beginning to the end of his view, it was totally good with some wrong things but with references only and table [1] there is no needed to , I have made some changes in the manuscript below.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-</p>	<p>1] First of all there are two ways for writing the references. This is alphabetical or numbering from the beginning of the manuscript to the end.</p> <p>2] there are two references were very very old and must be excluded as: Marcucci, 1995 Singleton and Rossi, 1965</p> <p>3] There are some ref. in the manuscript but not in the ref. list as: Ayumi, 1999 Kasiotis et a., 2017 Kumazawa and Ahn, 2019</p> <p>4] there are many ref. in the list but not in the manuscript which I exclude them as: Khacha-Anande et al., 2020 Sforcin, 2007 Bankova et al., 2005 Campos et al., 2014 Galeotti et al., 2018 Gulcin et al.,2010</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	Accepted after making the corrections SEE ATTACHMENT	

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>	All data are reported accurately and honestly, with no evidence of fabrication or falsification. Propolis is collected in a manner that ensures no harm to bee populations or their habitats, adhering to sustainable and ethical practices.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nermien Zakaria Ahmed Teleb
Department, University & Country	Egypt