

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)
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"><li>1. The English language should be improved.</li><li>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.</li><li>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.</li><li>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.</li><li>5. Provide details of the aerodynamic model.</li><li>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 ?</li></ol>	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Haim Abramovich
Department, University & Country	Israel