



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57748

Title: Uncovering research patterns in agripreneurship: A bibliometric analysis.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		√		
Techn. Quality			√	
Clarity		√		
Significance		√		

Reviewer's ID: JPR-212

Detailed Reviewer's Report

General Assessment

This paper provides a timely bibliometric overview of agripreneurship research using Scopus data and standard tools (Biblioshiny, VOSviewer). The topic is relevant, and the manuscript is largely readable. However, several methodological, analytical, and presentational shortcomings prevent it from being published in its current form. **Major revisions** are required to strengthen rigor, clarity, and contribution.

Major Concerns (Required for Revision)

1. Methodological Flaws & Missing Information

- **Search String Validity:** The search string uses TITLE-ABS-KEY with OR conditions for four synonymous terms. This may cause duplication (e.g., "farm entrepreneurship" is not always equivalent to agripreneurship). No validation or deduplication method is mentioned.
- **Data Range Issue:** The study claims to cover "1992 to 2026," but the data was retrieved on **11 May 2026**. This means the 2026 data is incomplete (only ~4.5 months). The authors must clarify or truncate the end year to 2025.
- **No PRISMA Flow Diagram:** A systematic bibliometric review requires a PRISMA-style flowchart showing identification, screening, eligibility, and inclusion steps. This is missing.
- **Subject Area Filter Justification:** The applied subject areas (ECON, SOCI, AGRI, BUSI, ENVI, MULT, EART, ARTS) seem arbitrary. Why exclude medicine, engineering, or computer science? Justification is needed.

2. Poor Quality / Missing Figures

- **Figure 4.1** (Bibliometric indicators) and **Figure 4.6** (author co-citation density) are not visible in the provided PDF. The reader cannot interpret them.
- **Figure 4.2** (year-wise publications) is mentioned but not shown. The description is insufficient without the visual.
- The **keyword co-occurrence network (Figure 4.7)** is described but not included. Without it, the cluster analysis (green/red/blue/purple) is unverifiable.

3. Citation & Author Analysis Issues

- **Most Global Cited Documents (Table 4.5):** All papers have only **3 total citations** and are mostly from *E3S Web of Conferences* (a proceedings series). This is not a reliable indicator of

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

“intellectual structure.” The authors should use **normalized citation impact** or restrict to peer-reviewed journals.

- **Fractionalized Articles (Table 4.4)**: The fractionalized values (e.g., 2.67, 1.11) are presented without explanation of how they were calculated. This is confusing for readers.

4. Conceptual Overlaps and Redundancy

- **Figure 4.8** (trend topics) and the **word cloud** are both discussed separately but convey similar information. The word cloud adds little value and should be moved to supplementary or removed.
- The discussion section largely repeats results without critical synthesis. For example, lines 251–258 restate growth trends already in results. The discussion should instead compare findings with prior bibliometric studies or explain *why* 2017 was an inflection point.

5. Missing Critical Components

- **No research questions** explicitly stated (objectives are given but not framed as questions).
- **No limitations section** – e.g., Scopus-only data, English bias, conference proceedings inclusion, incomplete 2026 data.
- **No future research directions** beyond generic statements (e.g., “interdisciplinary expansion”).

Minor Issues (Improve Clarity & Professionalism)

Location	Issue
Title (line 1)	Typo: “GRIPRENEURSHIP” → “AGRIPRENEURSHIP”
Abstract (line 5)	“prevailing in a nation” → “prevailing in a nation” (repetitive, can be shortened)
Line 27	Duplicate period: “economic growth. .”
Line 32	Inconsistent capitalization: “agripreneurship can be defined” (sentence starts lower-case)
Table 4.3	Formatting issue: column headers misaligned; “Ekonomika Apk” – verify spelling (is it “Ekonomika APK”?)
Line 135	“Journal” table heading missing; formatting breaks
Line 229	Duplicate figure call: “Figure 4.8 showing the word cloud” – but 4.8 was already trend topics. Renumber.
References	No reference list provided in the PDF. Cannot verify citation accuracy or completeness.

Specific Suggestions for Revision

1. **Revise the time frame** – End the analysis at 2025 or clearly state that 2026 data is partial.
2. **Add a PRISMA diagram** and explain deduplication, screening, and inclusion logic.
3. **Replace or remove missing figures** (4.1, 4.2, 4.6, 4.7). Ensure all visuals are embedded and legible.
4. **Drop the word cloud** – it is redundant with trend topics and co-occurrence network.
5. **Add a limitations subsection** before the conclusion, addressing:
 - Scopus-only database
 - Conference proceedings dominance in citation table
 - Language bias
 - Lack of qualitative validation
6. **Provide a reference list** in the final submission.

Verdict

Major revision required. The paper addresses an important and emerging topic, and the core bibliometric approach is sound. However, missing figures, incomplete data handling, methodological shortcuts, and redundant content currently undermine its scholarly quality. With careful revision –

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

especially to the methodology, visual presentation, and critical discussion – this paper could become a valuable contribution to agripreneurship literature