

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_127261
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Camber Variation on NACA 2412 Airfoil Efficiency and Its Implications for Adaptive Engineering Solutions
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The paper is about the effect of geometrical airfoil modifications, mainly camber variation, on the lift-to-drag coefficient.</p> <p>Comment 1: The paper should have been line-numbered for an easier referencing during review process.</p> <p>Comment 2: The abstract speaks about a predictive model, but it can't be found in the paper.</p> <p>Comment 3: There's a mixing in captions of Figs. 2 &amp; 3.</p> <p>Comment 4: In subsection 2.2 (Procedure), the authors refer in step 1 to a "diagram in Figure 5", but Figure 5 displays the lift-to-drag ratio against AoA.</p> <p>Comment 5: The equations in the sample L/D ratio calculations are in disorder and should be rectified.</p> <p>Comment 6: Figure 5 caption: it's L/D ratio vs AoA.</p> <p>Comment 7: In discussion and analysis, the authors claim that airfoils B and C have similar trends, from Fig. 5, it looks like that apart from AoA between 10 and 25, it's not the case due to the divergence outside this interval.</p> <p>Comment 8: "Discussion and analysis" section is underdeveloped.</p> <p>Comment 9: "Our findings align with Khanna et al. (2023)..." I can't find this reference by title alone (maybe with a link?).</p>	

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Kacem Zereg</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of Batna1, Algeria</b></p>