Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Geological Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJOGER_126063**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Mapping Ophiolite Research with an Emphasis on Naga Hill 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

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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. -		
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. 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. 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.	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Joyita Golder**
Department, University & Country	**Jadavpur University, India**