

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_86129
Title of the Manuscript:	Flutter modelling and computation of a flying wing aircraft
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript presents a study on modelling and flutter calculation of a flying wing. The topic has been in depth published in the literature and the present study does not anything new to the state of the art.</p> <p>Some comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The English language should be improved.2. Chapter 3.2 : the equations 1-5 are known and can be ignored. This chapter should give details about the code enabling the calculations of the natural frequencies and their associated modes. The author should prepare a paragraph describing the code, its accuracy and some validation of the code.3. Chapter 4 : again , Eq. 6 and 7 are known. It can be ignored. Describe how the flutter velocities were calculated. Provide a detailed description of the code, its accuracy, and validation.4. It is not clear if the present model of the flying wing, calculates flutter of only the wings or all the structure. Please discuss its issue.5. Provide details of the aerodynamic model.6. Discuss the results presented in Table 2. Why the flutter velocity is lower at 0.3 Mach than at 0.5 and 1.3 ?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Thanks. The authors have checked and modified the words carefully.2. Thanks. Another reviewer also requested the introduction of numerical method. So please forgive that the authors have not deleted this part. The authors have cited these equations by academic rules. And the introduction of the code was added. (p4 and p5)3. Thanks. Another reviewer also requested the introduction of numerical method. So please forgive that the authors have not deleted this part. The authors have cited these equations by academic rules. And the introduction of the code was added. (p6)4. Thanks. For aircraft, flutter is always just for the wings. But the present paper considered the influence of aerodynamic related to the whole aircraft aero surface modelling. The authors have added some contents to explain. (p6)5. Thanks. The authors have added some contents. (p6)6. Thanks. The authors have added some contents. (p8)
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	