

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_122794</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Understanding the Trends of Livestock Extension Research Through Bibliometric Analysis</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript's importance for the scientific community lies in its comprehensive analysis of livestock extension research trends in India, offering valuable insights into the evolving landscape of this critical field. The study provides a foundation for future research and policy development to enhance livestock productivity and sustainability by identifying key research areas, influential publications, and collaborative networks. This manuscript is precious for researchers and practitioners in agricultural sciences, as it highlights emerging trends and fosters interdisciplinary collaboration.</p> <p>I genuinely appreciate this manuscript. It offers a well-rounded and insightful analysis that is both informative and impactful. The depth of the research and the clarity in presenting the findings make it an excellent contribution to the field.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>TITLE OF THE ARTICLE</b></p> <p>The title is suitable; however, a more refined version could be: "Trends and Collaborations in Livestock Extension Research: A Bibliometric Analysis (2015-2024)." This revised title effectively captures the study's focus on research trends, collaborations, and the specified time frame, making it clear and precise.</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p><b>ABSTRACT</b></p> <p>The abstract is well-written and effectively conveys the essential details of the study. However, there are a few typographical errors, such as "VOS viewer" (which should be "VOSviewer") and "sourced," that should be corrected.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <p>To enhance the introduction section, the term "Livestock Extension" needs a more thorough explanation to ensure clarity and understanding for readers. Additionally, technical terms should be defined appropriately to provide a solid foundation for users, especially those unfamiliar with the subject matter. Including information about the database used for data extraction and consulting more recent articles on bibliometrics will further enrich the introduction.</p> <p><b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b></p> <p>This section should be logically organized. Mention the approach and method (Bibliometric) used for conducting the study, including when the search was performed and the exact date. Specify how many records were extracted and clarify whether all records were considered for the study or if some were excluded. Indicate the format in which the records were exported and list the keywords used to perform the search.</p> <p><b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b></p> <p>The results are logically and properly organized, with visual support provided by figures. The analysis includes information on the distribution of agricultural extension research publications by year and research category, as well as the top 10 journals on livestock extension research in India. Additionally, the results present network analysis based on co-authorship and citations, the top 10 agricultural extension publications in terms of total citations, and the top 10 most relevant affiliations in terms of total citations.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSIONS</b></p> <p>The conclusion highlights the study's key findings, providing relevant discussion to contextualize the</p>	

**Review Form 3**

	results. It effectively summarizes the main outcomes, emphasizing their significance within the field. To strengthen the conclusion, it is also important to address the limitations of the research. Discussing the limitations provides a balanced perspective, acknowledging any constraints in the study's methodology, data, or scope.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive use of bibliometric analysis, a well-established method for evaluating research trends. The study draws on a significant dataset from the dimension.ai database, covering a substantial period from January 2015 to June 2024. The thorough analysis incorporates various aspects such as publication trends, research categories, and network analysis, all presented with clear, data-driven insights. Using tools like VOS Viewer to identify collaborative networks and influential studies further enhances the credibility and depth of the research, making it a valuable contribution to the field.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =	<b>REFERENCES</b> The article has few references, which may not fully cover the topic. To improve the study, more literature should be consulted and included. Adding more references will provide better information on the subject, help support the findings, and make the research more reliable and well-rounded.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the language is suitable for scholarly communication; however, thorough proofreading is recommended to enhance clarity and ensure precision.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
	Recommended for publication with the revisions mentioned above.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Muhammad Hussain</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Khushal Khan Khattak University, Pakistan</b>