**Supplementary Figure 1**

Summary of authentication techniques and the number of samples and/or honey types analysed per technique by each study reviewed.

Inspection of these data confirms little has changed since Anklam 1998 [17] noted a prevalence of low numbers of samples in peer reviewed published studies, Source: Drawn by MW from data in Chin and Sowndhararajan 2020 [35]

(a) Sensory techniques, 6 studies, for one of which no sample numbers were reported
(b) Physicochemical techniques, 12 studies
(c) Chromatographic techniques, sugar profiles, 7 studies
(d) Chromatographic techniques, amino acid profiles, 6 studies
(e) Chromatographic techniques, phenolic and flavonoid compounds, 15 studies
(f) Chromatography-mass spectrometry, studies of volatile compounds (19) and sugar profiles (3)
(g) IRMS, 15 studies for 2 of which no sample numbers reported
(h) Spectroscopic techniques other than NMR
(i) NMR, 14 studies
(j) Molecular techniques, 14 studies for which 6 had no sample numbers reported
(k) Assorted other techniques, 11 studies
