

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <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.	I guess that the group of students wrote the paper presented here. The attached manuscript includes some recommendations for improvement. I appreciated their work but they should read the book: Theory of Wing Section to better understand the topics.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is.	
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.	Yes, but it should be improved by comparing the measured results and experimental by other authors.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, it must be improved.	
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.	It presents the experimental data obtained by a small wing produced by a 3D printer measured in the wind tunnel. The experimental data could be useful. Better and adequate interpretations of measurement should be done. The reason for this experiment should be included and the interpretation of expected results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, the list should be improved. 1. THEORY OF WING SECTIONS, Abbott and Doenhoff, 2. http://airfoiltools.com/airfoil/details?airfoil=naca2412-il 3. ...	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It could be improved.	
Optional/General comments	Further improvement is necessary.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Miodrag
Department, University & Country	VTI, Serbia