

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_93470
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of Research output of Tamil Nadu Agricultural University as reflected in Scopus and Web of Science
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Measures to assess research in the Web of Science (e.g. h index, TGCS and TLCS) should be defined. - The meaning of "document wise output", "subject wise research output", "country wise research output", "author wise research output", and "source wise research output" should be clarified. "Wise" is misleading and confusing. - The methods used to retrieve the number of publications analyzed in both databases should be explained in detail. How the selected records were extracted?, Who did the bibliographic search?, What key words were used?, the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the selection of articles should be specified. - Records mean articles? Other document types? - Growth rates are percentages? AGR value? - Please, define the heading "Sl. No" in the tables. - Collaboration institutions refers to "multicenter studies", "two-center studies" ? - It is interesting to know the percentage of sponsorship (funding) for the overall publications. - Publication counting is not synonymous of effectiveness of research. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please check the use of capital letters. - English may be improved ("calamities"?) - Findings of the study are really the concluding remarks - The present Conclusion is too general. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is an interesting bibliometric evaluation but better description of the methods is mandatory, so any reader would be able to replicate the study. - Suggestions 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marta Pulido
Department, University & Country	University of Barcelona, Spain