

Comments

The developed method for the authentication of unifloral honey (Jarrah), is novel. The concern for botanical authentication of honey is global and present methods need many specifications that is significantly covered by the researchers of this article. Moreover, this study will help other researchers to authenticate the different unifloral varieties across the globe. After critically reviewing this paper I accept this manuscript for the publication, but before that there are certain points that need improvement. The following points need much consideration by the author to improve the quality of this paper.

1. In the abstract section line number 28-29, the meaning of the sentence is unclear, please make it clearer.
2. In line number 63-65, add European standard for monofloral honey (pollen percentage).
3. Line number 65-63 add average glycaemic index of jarrah honey.
4. Line number 82-84: The conclusion part of introduction section needs much elaboration, that who this method will help the governing bodies to establish new standards for unifloral honey and tackle the issue of unethical labelling of unifloral honey.
5. In section 2.2.1, clearly mention proper location with GPS coordinates and the date when the nectar sample were collected.
6. In section 2.2.3 the preparation of jarrah honey blend is unclear, elaborate this section so that the reader didn't get confused.
7. In the results section the author refers 31 honey samples (section 3.1) and the authentication procedure like melissopalynology is missing. Basically, the team is trying to develop an authentication method but there is a lack of validation part with existing methods. So, it is a advice to look into this matter. Because at this point before developing a method you should collect the data based on existing methods. How can you rely on the beekeepers without analysing the facts. The analysed samples might be not under the EC standards for unifloral honey (>45% pollen of one source)..
8. Author has to add the microscopic images of Jarrah pollen.
9. In Results and discussion section 3.2. The author has collected the samples from 2015-2020 (table 1). And it is evident that the storage time has greater effect of the DN and HMF content as well as other compounds in the honey. In the paper on one value of each parameter is mentioned. Please mention every parameter of each sample in the table only and elaborate the discussion (considering the moisture, Diastase and HMF) to make it understandable to the audiences.
10. Line number 348 need correction, rewrite the sentence.
11. Line 350 and 365 citations need correction.
12. The conclusion part is lacking in defining the scope of the proposed method, so improve the conclusion and highlight the scope and applications. Overall, the structure of conclusion need refinement (general statement, aim, finding, scope, conclusion highlights the benefits of research to the society).

After all these corrections the paper can be accepted for publication.