

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_127281
Title of the Manuscript:	Longitudinal Morphology of the Morning Counter Equatorial Electrojet during Low solar activity
Type of the 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 <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.	The article is original. It is scientifically robust and gives more understanding to equatorial electrojet features.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes! It is suitable.	
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.	It is comprehensive and requires no addition nor reduction.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	It is original and the authors were able to prove their work scientifically. This research equally gives more incite into seasonal and diurnal variations of EEJ.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The authors did poorly on the refences. (a) the references are outdated. Therefore, should be replaced with recent articles. (b) The work is manually referenced. The authors are advised to use Mendeley or any other AI to reference the work.	
Minor REVISION comments	Good.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	It is advisable to use recent articles in referencing the work. There are many articles in this area and I, published in this area by 2020 and 2021.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Azi, Amaechi Onele
Department, University & Country	Federal Polytechnic of Oil and Gas, Nigeria