

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_118730
Title of the Manuscript:	Trends and evolution of research on genetic modification: A bibliometric analysis of scientific literature during 2000-2020
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 suggestions of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, it offers insightful bibliometric analysis of important journals and articles in GM research, showcasing influential sources and trends. 2. The title is not provided, but a suitable one could be: "<i>Bibliometric Analysis and Co-Citation Mapping of Highly Referenced Journals in GM Research.</i>" 3. The abstract does not provide proper information, however summarizes the study's objectives, methodology, main findings, and implications. 4. Yes, it seems appropriate. Clearly defined sections such as Introduction, Methodology, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion are recommended. 5. Based on the provided text, it appears scientifically correct. A full review of the methodology and data analysis is needed to confirm. 6. Yes, the references are from well-respected sources. Including recent bibliometric studies in related fields could strengthen the manuscript. 7. How were journals and articles selected for the co-citation analysis, and what criteria were used? How might this selection process affect the interpretation of co-citation clusters? 8. Were diverse research fields considered in the analysis of GM research journals? How might the absence of certain disciplines affect the validity of the co-citation clusters identified? 9. There are grammatical mistakes here; repeating words in the same line is disrupting the sentence structure (in the introduction). 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, the language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

Review Form 1.7

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ubaid Ullah Khan
Department, University & Country	The University of Lahore, Pakistan