

Journal Name:	Asian Basic and Applied Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ABAARJ_1774
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY OF COSMIC RAY VARIABILITY DURING A SOLAR MAGNETIC CYCLE (SOLAR CYCLES 23 AND 24)
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>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1- It has good scientific content and is useful for scientific research. 2- A scientific manuscript that deals with an important scientific topic in our daily lives. 3- It explains the dangers of radiation on the living environment.	Thank you for your valuable comments.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is appropriate	
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, the summary of the article is comprehensive	Thank you.
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.	1- Use it for scientific references. 2- It has good scientific content and is useful for scientific research. 3- A scientific manuscript that deals with an important scientific topic in our daily lives. 4- It explains the dangers of radiation on the living environment.	Noted.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	no	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. The sources used are old. There is no modern source. 2. There is no comparison with the results of other research presented in the reference. 3. The topic is old. There are no new results about it.	

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>	