

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_128189
Title of the Manuscript:	CHARACTERIZATION OF EQUATORIAL IONIZATION ANOMALY AT THE SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE IN AFRICA DURING MODERATE 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is important to the scientific community since its investigating the features of Equatorial ionization anomaly which is an important feature where the Earth is characterized by two regions having enhanced electron density and lying approximately 15 – 20 degrees North or South of equator. In this case the African southern hemisphere is being considered during high solar activity period of solar cycle 24	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Not suitable. The author can consider changing it to "Characterization of equatorial ionization anomaly at the African Southern hemisphere during a solar activity period"	
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.	The abstract is hollow and lacks flow. It should be rewritten to capture all the aspects of the study and should flow.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes. It is presenting results on the use of TEC from GNSS to characterize the ionosphere over the EIA region during high solar activity period.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	They are sufficient. However, the referencing has not been arranged in an orderly manner. The author should check on the numbering in the manuscript. For example on page 1 line 5, the author began the first reference as [37], instead of [1]. The author to avoid writing e.g with the reference. For example on page 1 line, the author has written [eg[37]; on page 1 line 7 he has written [eg[8,10,14] ; page 1 line he has written [eg[25] etc	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is okay. However a mix-up of tenses and a few grammatical mistakes have been noted. The author should make corrections.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The use of ΔTEC in the manuscript is wrong and should be removed. ΔTEC means change in TEC or detrended TEC and can be used in the context used by the author. 2. Figures 2a and 2b should be merged into one figure for continuity and renamed "Figure 2" 3. Figure 3a and 3b should be merged into one figure for continuity and renamed "Figure 3" 4. 2013 was not a moderate solar activity period but a high solar activity period. The author to correct. 5. The author should include a plot of solar wind parameters and Ap index for the months of 2013 so that their variations can be observed and be used in discussing the results. 6. The author should address all the areas that have been highlighted in the manuscript. <p>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Edward Uluma
Department, University & Country	Masinde Muliro University Of Science And Technology, Kenya