

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	The sentence from the abstract (page 1) "Flying wing aircraft has many encouraging advantages versus that unsteady aerodynamic of the structures still retain uncertainty." is very confusing. Please revise it!	
Minor REVISION comments	It is preferable to write Neurons instead "neurons" (page 1). I was not able to see two pictures from Fig. 2 (a and b). Please try to solve this issue!	
Optional/General comments	Unfortunately, the author does not compare its numerical results with the experimental ones. However, it is difficult to obtain the experimental results.	

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:	Niculescu Mihai Leonida
Department, University & Country	INCAS - National Institute for Aerospace Research "Elie Carafoli", Romania