

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

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment After performing a few minor comments, the anonymous reviewer recommends publishing the manuscript.	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 work is related to the TEC oscillation through the May 11 intense storm. The authors collect the TEC data from different stations. They discuss TEC variations.	
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.	Yes. But needs a few things.	
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.	The abbreviations should be removed from the abstract. There is a confusing situation related to the stations' position. Remove all the coordinates from the abstract. The author may add one paper related to the Saint Patrick's Day super storm that is: (Eroglu, E. Modeling the superstorm in the 24th solar cycle. Earth Planets Space 71, 26 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40623-019-1002-1)	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Yes. Maybe, The author may add one paper related to the Saint Patrick's Day super storm that is: (Eroglu, E. Modeling the superstorm in the 24th solar cycle. Earth Planets Space 71, 26 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40623-019-1002-1)	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	After performing a few minor comments, the anonymous reviewer recommends publishing the manuscript	

Review Form 3

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:	Emre Eroglu
Department, University & Country	Epoka University, Albania