

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_129555
Title of the Manuscript:	Variation of the critical frequency of the ionospheric layer F2 at the ionosonde station of Ouagadougou during moderate geomagnetic activities at the minimum and maximum phases of solar cycles 21 and 22
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 <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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript outlines clearly how the critical frequency varies during moderate geomagnetic storms. It shows the procedure for computing the ionospheric storms based on the critical frequency. This is an important input for model developers interested in modelling ionospheric storms.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is sufficient.	
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.	There should be some consistency in using either geomagnetic cloud or magnetic cloud. Instead of solar phase minimum use solar minimum phase. The abstract doesnot talk about any result during solar maximum phase yet this is included in the title. I suggest that the authors make a comparison of what happens during solar minimum of solar cycle 21 and 22, and do the same for the solar maximum phase.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct with clear scirntific findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There should should be some consistency in citing the references and even in their write-up at the end of the manuscript.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear and appropriate.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Valence Habyarimana
Department, University & Country	Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Uganda