

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_99429
Title of the Manuscript:	Statistical Analysis of the Most Prominent Geoeffective Coronal Mass Ejections Associated with Intense Geomagnetic Storms in Solar Cycle 24
Type of the Article	Short communication

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

(<https://www.journaliaari.com/index.php/IAARJ/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	This short communication is a reasonable investigation about CME. The title is suitable. Necessary to identify in the Abstract the meaning of CME. In the Introduction is identified, but it is important to expose also in the Abstract. Important to introduce some photographs of the phenomena. It is good for reading, including to a non scholar reader. The references are adequated.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor revisions as pointed out.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Marcos Cesar Danhoni Neves
Department, University & Country	State University of Maringá, Brazil