

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 Обязательное	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.	Understanding the solar cycle is an important part of life in our solar system. Solar flares can disrupt satellites and communication signals traveling around the Earth. This activity can even affect electricity grids on Earth. Studying these processes allows us to better understand nature and helps us explore the cosmic environment that surrounds our planet. In this sense, the topic of this manuscript is very relevant. The importance of this manuscript to the scientific community lies in its research methodology, which provides new perspectives in this field of research. This research will help advance our understanding of the solar cycle and its underlying mechanisms.	Thank you for your valuable comments.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article matches the content.	Thank you
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 reflects the essence of the study.	Thank you
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate	Thank you
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 content is presented clearly, in scientific language. There is no repetition or unnecessary information.	Thank you
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The author mainly refers to contemporary relevant sources.	Thank you
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the English language of the manuscript corresponds to scientific communication.	Thank you
<u>Optional/General</u> 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>	