

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	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.	This manuscript investigates the longitudinal characteristics of the Morning Counter-Equatorial Electrojet (MCEJ) during low solar activity in 2008. Using data from four equatorial stations, the authors identify two categories of MCEJ events and study their seasonal and longitudinal variations, contributing valuable information on ionospheric and magnetospheric dynamics.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is ok	
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.	Abstract comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are 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.	The topic is timely and addresses a gap in understanding MCEJ phenomena during low solar activity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It would be appropriate to add current references to the study. Especially research in the last ten years can be included.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The abstract is full of technical terms, making it difficult for non-experts to grasp. Terms such as "negative excursions in the H-component" should be simplified or briefly defined for clarity. 2. In the introduction, it may be useful to highlight more recent studies specific to the topic. Especially CEJ (Counter Equatorial Electrojet) research in the last decade could be included. 3. Briefly discuss how this study builds on or differs from earlier works, especially those of Rastogi (1974) and Kane & Trivedi (1981), to highlight its novelty. 4. Explain the criteria for selecting the 2008 data set. Why was this year specifically selected? Were there alternative data sets considered? 5. Descriptions of graphs and tables can be strengthened. For example, the texts used under Figure 1 and Figure 2 can be made more descriptive so that the reader can quickly understand the content. 6. Discuss potential implications of the findings for space weather forecasting or related applications. How can this research inform broader ionospheric studies?	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript makes a valuable contribution to the understanding of MCEJ phenomena. With minor revisions for clarity, terminology consistency, and expanded discussion, it is suitable for publication.	

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:	Fuat Basciftci
Department, University & Country	Karamanoglu Mehmetbey University, Vocational School of Technical Sciences, Turkiye