

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_111134
Title of the Manuscript:	GEOMAGNETIC STORM VARIATION OF VERTICAL TOTAL ELECTRON CONTENT (VTEC) OVER SOME EURO-AFRICAN STATIONS
Type of the Article	

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript systematizes several observations of vertical total electron content (VTEC) at different latitudes and during different phases of solar activity. The authors demonstrate changes in VTEC caused by the fountain effect during geomagnetic storms. Understanding the impact of solar activity on the ionosphere is of great importance, that is why this observational paper should be helpful for scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title well represents the main idea of the manuscript</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract briefly gives the main idea of the manuscript</p> <p>4. Yes, the manuscript is well organised</p> <p>5. Yes, it seems to be reasonable, in spite of rather simplified model used to find VTEC from STEC. For their future investigations the authors should estimate the impact of this simplification.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are good.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language is good, but I think I found one misprint at page 4: "may be as a result" probably should be replaced with "may be a result"</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Julia Kropotina</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ioffe Institute, Russia</b>