

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	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.	
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:	Kuo-Chien , Liao
Department, University & Country	Chaoyang University of Technology, Taiwan