

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_126063
Title of the Manuscript:	Mapping Ophiolite Research with an Emphasis on Naga Hills Ophiolite: Biblioshiny Analysis
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	1. The article would benefit from a stronger justification for the choice of the Web of Science database, particularly in relation to its advantages over other bibliometric sources.	Incorporated the following lines, highlighted on page no. 2. WoS offers high quality and curated indexing from selective coverage of influential publications across various fields. A thorough longitudinal examination of research trends established for understanding the foundational and emerging areas within the field is made possible by WoS extensive multidisciplinary coverage. Additionally, WoS database integrates well with bibliometric tools such as Biblioshiny for advanced citation analysis.
	2. A more extensive literature review is necessary to contextualize the research, identify gaps in previous studies, and clarify the scope of the current work.	Incorporated the following lines, highlighted on page no. 1 Current studies have documented isolated aspects of the NHO's petrological, geochemical and tectonic features, but there is an absence of a comprehensive overview that integrates these findings into a clear picture of how the NHO has evolved. A thorough understanding of the genetic relationships between various rock types within the NHO remains underexplored. The work carried out in this paper offers an overview study of the NHO, which has received relatively less attention compared to other major ophiolite complexes worldwide. This paper undertakes a bibliometric analysis, using existing studies to identify trends and highlight areas in need of future research work. Incorporated the following lines, highlighted in page no. 2. Through the analysis of the most commonly used terms from titles, authors and keywords will reveal valuable insights into current research trends.
	3. While the objectives and strengths of the bibliometric analysis are clearly stated, the importance of the findings should be articulated more explicitly to highlight their contributions to the field.	Incorporated the following line,s highlighted on page no 13 The study identifies the active research areas that identify where the focus lies in the ophiolites, guiding future research trends and helping in understanding which aspects to currently prioritize. The available studies cover various aspects, including the origin and serpentinization of ultramafic rocks, tectonic evolution and the geochemical characteristics of the NHO rocks. However, many of these works are isolated and do not provide an integrated framework to connect the findings across different studies. For instance, while some articles explore the metamorphic history and petrogenesis of the NHO, they lack comprehensive discussions on how these processes interrelate within the broader geological context. Understanding the context not only enhances the discussion about NHO but also lays the groundwork for future research. This can help address gaps in knowledge and look into topics that haven't received much attention in the current studies. The findings emphasize the growing academic interest in the NHO, which is critical for fostering further exploration and investigation.

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	