

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_123863
Title of the Manuscript:	IONOSPHERIC TOTAL ELECTRON CONTENT RESPONSE TO THE INTENSE GEOMAGNETIC STORM OF 10TH -11TH MAY 2024
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 (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.	I like this manuscript because the author has studied recent storms and its outcome is good for the scientific community	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Has to revised	
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.	Has to be more clear	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes very good arranged	
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.	Results are seen clearly in the figures but has to illustrated in the text properly	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are good enough	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Has to be revised to convey the findings from the figures.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>General comments Title: should be specific to the study Selection of station: its basis is not mentioned Abstract: has to be revised Introduction: very good Data acquisition and methodology: is good but stations are not listed properly Results The variation of IMF-Bz, IEF-Ey, SW Speed, kp and Dst indices between 8th -13th May 2024: well, described The variation of solar activity for May 2024: well, explained The variation of the TEC between 8th and 13th May 2024 over BAKE, DUND, SUTH, BELE, BJFS and MBAR: has to be revised a lot Conclusion: has to be rewritten Figures: 5 to 10 has to be drawn in the same time axis and same TEC variation for 8 to 13 days. Also, storm duration has to be shown there as other literatures.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Drabindra Pandit</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>St. Xavier's College, Nepal</p>