

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_128761
Title of the Manuscript:	A new look at the Great Red Spot of Jupiter
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 importance of this paper lies in its contribution to understanding the dynamics and persistence of Jupiter's Great Red Spot (GRS), one of the most iconic and enduring features in the Solar System.	Thanks for the comments.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	Thanks for the comments.
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 of the article is informative but could be considered somewhat incomplete or unclear in certain areas. Strengths: Key Focus Identified Proposed Mechanisms Predicted Features Thermodynamic Insight Weaknesses: Lack of Specificity Insufficient Context Unclear Connections Impact Not Highlighted	A few minor improvements to the text have been made. As an example ‘depth’ has been replaced by ‘ exponential depth’ in the line after (12)’
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	To determine whether the manuscript is scientifically correct, one would need to carefully assess its assumptions, methods, calculations, and interpretations. Based solely on the abstract, the manuscript appears to propose an intriguing and plausible mechanism for the dynamics of Jupiter's Great Red Spot (GRS), but there are potential areas that warrant scrutiny.	Noted thanks
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references provided are partially sufficient but require supplementation to comprehensively support the manuscript's claims and situate it within the broader context of existing research.	The second Bye et al Reference has been updated

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Not up to the mark	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The abstract is somewhat comprehensive but could be improved with more specific details about methodology, clearer connections to existing research, and a stronger emphasis on the study's significance.</p> <p>Include a brief mention of the methods or models used (e.g., how the OGCM is applied to Jupiter's atmospheric conditions).</p> <p>Explicitly state how this study advances the understanding of the GRS compared to prior work.</p> <p>Elaborate on the analogy with Earth's ocean processes to strengthen the link for readers unfamiliar with oceanography.</p> <p>Highlight the broader implications of the findings for planetary science and atmospheric modeling.</p>	Thanks for the comments.

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)	