

Journal Name:	Asian Basic and Applied Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ABAARJ_1792
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ACCELERATING AND DECELERATING CORONAL MASS EJECTIONS (CMEs) DURING 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: 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.	Very few studies have been done comparing accelerating CMEs and decelerating CMES thus this study is important to the scientific community since its exploiting an area that has not been fully exploited. Considering the fact that it is also comparing two recently concluded solar cycles 23 and 24 makes the manuscript to be the best when the it will be published and thus it fills an existing gap in the scientific community	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is okay	
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.	Line 13 (Statistical analysis like) delete the word 'like' Line 15 include the value of correlations and not just use the word 'there exist a stronger correlation'	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes scientifically is correct however I feel the following corrections need to be done to make it more better <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. On data collection provide the link where you downloaded the data and not just the website name. I suggest that provide both the link and the name.2. The last paragraph under data collection that information is irrelevant there it can be included in the introduction and not data collection3. Fig 1 is not part of your results there remove it at this point it can be used to build your introduction4. Line 129 write CPA in full since it's the first time its appearing.5. I suggest that it could be better if the plots were done for accelerating SC 23 and accelerating SC 24 together then a separate plot for decelerating SC 23 and SC 24 together for example it's not easy to tell exactly what is happening in figure 14 to 22 but if the components are reduced to two than it will be easy to see the plots.6. In the methodology I suggest that the author need to state the nature of data obtained from OMNI web and how it was processed until its plotted	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient. However, the introduction should be beefed up to include more related works.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is scholarly though I suggest line 38 should be re written and the word 'we' should be removed when citing the work done	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Accept the paper when the minor corrections are addressed.	

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:	Wilberforce Muniafu Wanjala
Department, University & Country	Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya