

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_90402
Title of the Manuscript:	Research Productivity of Tamilnadu Agricultural University as reflected in Scopus Database: A Scientometric Dimension
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/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	<p>1. Introduction: Content available but lacks credible citations to support it. Instead, link each paragraph. And the last section describes how beneficial the study results will be.</p> <p>2. Literature review: It should be divided into topics such as the background of Tamilnadu Agricultural University, Scopus, and related research that the authors have presented in this article.</p> <p>3. The findings require discussion.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. The conclusion heading should add recommendations for academic use and future studies</p> <p>2. There are references at the end of the article. There must also be references in the content. Make sure your journal's references are written in APA or Vancouver style, so they are all the same.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Author name format list 1 is not like the others. - Item 6 Dr. has been added to the author's name, which should be eliminated. - Writing references from multiple styles are not the same, e.g., items 5, 8, and 9. have different writing styles. 	
Optional/General comments	More abstracts of critical findings and taking advantage of these findings for future research.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Titiya Netwong
Department, University & Country	Suan Dusit University, Thailand