

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal</a>
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.journaliaarj.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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Answer:</b> 1. <b>Poor</b>  2. <b>Yes</b>  3. <b>Abstract is not clear. Authors need to rearrange your abstract.</b>  4. <b>No, structure is not appropriate. Example: Pls expand your introduction.</b> 5. <b>No.</b> 6. <b>No.</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the objective of your research and your research problem?</li> <li>• I cannot see any formula related to your graphs.</li> <li>• Pls discuss more about your research problem.</li> <li>• Pls explain more in the materials, and results.</li> <li>• Conclusion needs more efforts.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	No, Pls improve your MS English writing.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mostafa El-Shafie
Department, University & Country	Nagoya University, Japan