

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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The paper results from quite a helpful experiment showing scientific quality. 2. This is not a novelty but a joint experiment. It would help if you emphasized your input more. 3. The relative values in Figure 3 are ambiguous and cannot be identified effectively. 4. It is recommended to propose limits for dynamic simulations or comparisons with wind tunnels. 5. There's no comparative analysis to justify the claim of this paper. 6. Some recommendations/comments (some of many others) 7. Overall, the paper is of average quality and needs improvement. The scientific novelty is unclear. I recommend a revision.	1. Thanks. 2. Thanks. This work proposed flutter computation of the flying aircraft which is difficult to be found during the existing works. This paper wanted to present this kind of numerical analysis of the aircraft with useful computational method and some discussions related to different flight situations. 3. Thanks. Fig.3 is a normal dynamic analysis process of the aircraft structure which can be recognized as mode analysis. 4. Thanks. Basic dynamic characteristic analysis of a structure usually be verified by ground vibration tests (GVT) rather than wind tunnels. But it is still sorry that an experimental structure is very expensive to be made and not a normal way to study the flutter characteristics of the flying wing aircraft initially. 5. Thanks. Flutter computation of the present aircraft is not possible to be found. This paper wanted to discuss flutter characteristics of a popular flying wing which faced to aerospace engineering. Similar comparative analysis is difficult to be found. 6. Thanks. This comment may be not complete. 7. Thanks. The authors have checked the paper carefully.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> 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)	