

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>Comments on the paper</p> <p>A STUDY OF COSMIC RAY VARIABILITY DURING A SOLAR MAGNETIC CYCLE (SOLAR CYCLES 23 AND 24)</p> <p>The authors investigate the variations in Cosmic Ray intensities during Solar Cycles 23 and 24, considering the changes in CR intensities, solar wind parameters, and geomagnetic indices - and separating the analysis of the ascending and declining phases of SCs 23 and 24. The methods rely on the standard classical methods of statistical analysis of observational data.</p> <p>They report an exhaustive review of previous investigations, focused on the available less systematic and less exhaustive studies.</p> <p>The general results are certainly useful for all investigators of solar-terrestrial relations.</p> <p>The phenomenon, however, is extremely intricate - and it is therefore unlikely that one or a few indices alone, dealing either with cosmic rays, or with solar indices, or with solar wind parameters, or with geomagnetic indices, can give justice of the complicated nature of phenomena.</p> <p>Certainly, this paper helps to focus on the enormous difficulty to give a physical interpretation of phenomena – and as such, the paper helps to set order and make clarity on the difficulties of this kind of statistical investigations.</p> <p>The paper is well written, and can be easily read, with fluent English.</p> <p>I have just two “technical” suggestions.</p> <p>Concerning Fig. 17, it can be read on a PC by expanding the size. I wonder if it can be readable on a printed journal. I suggest using several figures of much larger size.</p> <p>In addition, I personally greatly appreciate when papers contain at the very end a list of acronyms. This is very helpful for the reader to memorize the acronyms used in the paper. This takes a comparably small space, even though it is of great help for the audience.</p> <p>I have no conflict of interest.</p> <p>To my understanding, the paper can be published as it is.</p> <p>I have no need to remain anonymous.</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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Giovanni P. Gregori
Department, University & Country	IDASC, Italy