

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_128305
Title of the Manuscript:	Mapping the Literature on Good Agricultural Practices: A Bibliometric Approach Using the Scopus Data
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides a comprehensive bibliometric analysis of Good Agricultural Practices (GAP), offering valuable insights into global research trends, regional disparities, and critical research gaps. By synthesizing data from 1,732 publications, it highlights the socio-economic and environmental challenges of GAP adoption, particularly in underrepresented regions, which is crucial for guiding future research and policy development. The findings underscore the importance of integrating advanced technologies, such as precision agriculture, and addressing socio-economic barriers to enhance GAP's global implementation. This work is a significant contribution to the scientific community, as it informs policymakers, researchers, and practitioners about the current state of GAP research and provides a framework for promoting sustainable agricultural practices worldwide.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	However, it could be refined for greater precision or impact, depending on the intended audience and focus. Suggestions for Improvement <ol style="list-style-type: none"> If the study emphasizes global trends or thematic insights, you could revise the title to: -"Global Trends in Good Agricultural Practices Research: A Bibliometric Study Using Scopus Data" -"Analyzing Research on Good Agricultural Practices (GAP): A Bibliometric Approach to Global Trends" If the focus is on identifying research gaps and future directions, you could use: -"Mapping Research Gaps and Trends in Good Agricultural Practices: A Bibliometric Analysis Using Scopus Data" If the emphasis is on visualization and synthesis of literature, a potential revision could be: -"A Visual Bibliometric Analysis of Good Agricultural Practices Research Using Scopus Data" 	
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.	The abstract is fairly comprehensive, as it outlines the key objectives, methodology, findings, and implications of the study. However, there are areas where it could be improved for clarity, balance, and completeness. Below are specific suggestions for improvement. Suggestions for Improvement: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Expand on the Research Significance: While the abstract mentions that the study is globally relevant, it could further emphasize why the research on GAP is important in the context of global challenges (e.g., climate change, food security). Provide More Specific Findings: Instead of broadly mentioning that 1,732 papers were examined, include specific insights such as the most active regions, key journals, or dominant topics in GAP research. Clarify Research Gaps: The abstract mentions a lack of focus on developing regions and socio-economic obstacles but could provide more detail about what specific challenges exist (e.g., lack of resources, knowledge dissemination, or infrastructure). Balance Between Findings and Implications: The abstract currently leans toward findings. Including more concrete implications for policy, practice, or future research 	

Review Form 3

	<p>would make it more impactful.</p> <p>5. Address Limitations (Optional): Briefly mentioning any limitations of the study (e.g., dependence on Scopus data, language restrictions) would add transparency and credibility.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Evaluation of Scientific Validity The manuscript is scientifically sound and well-structured. It demonstrates a clear research objective, employs appropriate bibliometric tools (e.g., Scopus, VOS viewer, Biblioshiny), and presents findings comprehensively through figures and tables. Key strengths include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Robust Analysis: Covers trends, keyword networks, author efficiency, and regional disparities, effectively identifying research gaps (e.g., socioeconomic obstacles, regional imbalances, and long-term impacts of GAP). Actionable Insights: Provides practical recommendations for policy frameworks, public-private partnerships, and technological advancements to improve GAP adoption. <p>Areas for Improvement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Methodological Limitations: Address dependency on Scopus and language bias (English-only studies). Statistical Depth: Include statistical tests to validate trends and comparisons. Practical Applications: Expand on how findings can directly guide agricultural policies and practices. <p>Conclusion The manuscript is scientifically accurate but can be improved with more focus on methodological transparency, statistical analyses, and practical implications to enhance its impact.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are relevant and mostly up-to-date, but including more recent publications (2022–2023), particularly those addressing technology, socio-economic barriers, and regional GAP challenges, would make the research more comprehensive.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript uses formal, precise, and academic language that aligns with the expectations of scholarly publications. However, there are areas where the language can be improved to enhance readability, coherence, and flow.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Based on the content of the manuscript, there do not appear to be any ethical issues. However, the following points ensure ethical considerations have been adequately addressed. However, as a best practice, the authors should ensure accurate reporting, appropriate attribution, and avoidance of overgeneralization in their conclusions. There are no evident competing interest issues in the manuscript. However, an explicit declaration in the paper would strengthen its credibility and transparency. There are no indications of plagiarism in this manuscript. The content appears to be original and not duplicated from other sources.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sonthaya Sampaonthong
Department, University & Country	Kasetsart University, Kamphaeng Saen Campus, Thailand