

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_112978
Title of the Manuscript:	“Exploring the Landscape of Entrepreneurial Behavior Among Farmers: A Bibliometric Analysis Using the Dimension Research Database”
Type of the Article	Review Article

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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Very few references are used, the reference requirements requested by the publisher from the review article are 50 - 150 titles.</p>	<p>We sincerely appreciate the thorough evaluation conducted by the reviewer and their positive assessment of the manuscript's significance, title, abstract, structure, and scientific accuracy. The feedback regarding the limited number of references is duly noted, and we are committed to addressing this concern by significantly expanding the reference list, ensuring it aligns with the publisher's requirement of 50 - 150 titles. This valuable input guides us in fortifying the scholarly foundation of the article. We are grateful for the constructive critique, and these comments will undoubtedly contribute to refining and strengthening the overall quality of our work.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article is good and shows the suitability of the title with the results obtained. Improvements that need to be made are in the conclusion section. In this section the author should only explain the conclusions from the review results obtained, there is no need to mention explanations of certain images.	Acknowledging the positive evaluation, we'll enhance the conclusion by focusing solely on key review findings, omitting image-related explanations. Grateful for constructive feedback, committed to improving clarity and impact.

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i> Certainly, I appreciate the reviewer's insightful feedback. I agree with the suggested improvement in the conclusion section. I have revised the manuscript accordingly, specifically focusing on highlighting key review findings while omitting unnecessary explanations of images. The revised section is marked in the manuscript for easy identification. Thank you for the valuable guidance, and I trust these changes enhance the overall quality of the article.
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	