

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal</a>
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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	The Author/s bring out an important aspect of Counter Electrojet phenomena, linking it to nighttime currents from the magnetosphere. They have cited many classic papers on the subject, but it is lacking in updated publications.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	Additions need to be made in terms of updating the discussions and conclusions in the light of more recent work.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. The sections are incomplete. Information, table/ maps of the locations of observatories from which data has been used is missing. Data analysis/ reduction is discussed, therefore, some example of Sq variation (non electrojet), electrojet and CEJ need to be shown. There is no map or table showing the location of the observatories whose data is used in the study. Full name, coordinates and then abbreviation of ALL stations used in the may be introduced into data part. Figure showing normal electrojet, compared to Sq at nearby station, (since this is used to estimate the EEJ strength) and then sample of CEJ/MCEJ may be given	
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 matter is correct, but incomplete. Discussion is lacking current models, theories and observations. Differences at longitudinal separation (specified in hours, should also give degrees) is mentioned invoking work of Kane et al. Much more recent work has been published need to be discussed either with results or in discussion..	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	No. references are insufficient. I have provided some references. Longitudinal variability of the equatorial counter electrojet during the solar cycle 24, Volume 63, pages 304–319, (2019) <a href="#">Gabriel Soares</a> , et al, Constraints on Scale Lengths of Equatorial Electrojet and Counter Electrojet Phenomena From the Indian Sector <a href="#">R. K. Archana</a> , <a href="#">N. Phani Chandrasekhar</a> , <a href="#">Kusumita Arora</a> , <a href="#">Nandini Nagarajan</a> Comprehensive Analysis of the Counter Equatorial Electrojet: Average Properties as Deduced From CHAMP Observations <a href="#">Yun-Liang Zhou</a> , <a href="#">Hermann Lühr</a> , <a href="#">Hong-wen Xu</a> , <a href="#">Patrick Alken</a> , 2018 Equatorial Counter Electrojet Longitudinal and Seasonal Variability in the American Sector <a href="#">Gabriel Soares</a> , <a href="#">Yosuke Yamazaki</a> , <a href="#">Jürgen Matzka</a> , <a href="#">Katia Pinheiro</a> , <a href="#">Achim Morschhauser</a> , <a href="#">Claudia Stolle</a> , <a href="#">Patrick Alken</a> , 2018 <a href="https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JA025968">https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JA025968</a>	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This paper needs updating with current work. Data provided in the paper needs to be validated with examples, figures may be redrawn to show the morphology more clearly instead of using only occurrence frequency bars .	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Nandini Nagarajan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>CSIR-National Geophysical Research Institute, India</b>