

**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	Journal Article

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The text under consideration is extremely basic, resembling a laboratory practical manual for K-12 pupils rather than a high-quality scientific publication. The majority of the text appears to be adapted from user guides for regular wind tunnel studies, which considerably reduces its uniqueness and significance.</li> <li>2. The writing's technical level is subpar, and the results do not fulfill the journal's publication requirements. Greater emphasis should have been placed on the precise presentation of formulas and equations, as the current handling is elementary and lacks depth. Furthermore, key factors like the blockage ratio are missing from the analysis.</li> <li>3. The stated results are inconsistent with well-established physical principles. For example, lift should decrease as camber decreases; instead, the manuscript reveals facts that differ dramatically from this common expectation. This mismatch shows that the experimental results should be reevaluated for correctness and reliability.</li> <li>4. The experimental methodologies and error determination are handled effectively, but the overall report lacks technical rigor. Furthermore, using the word "we" is unsuitable in a formal scientific publication and should be avoided.</li> <li>5. Substantial modifications are required to improve technical quality and verify that the paper is consistent with the journal's criteria.</li> <li>6. It is preferable to submit as Teaching Document.</li> </ol>	
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?	Need improvements	
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.	The accuracy of the reading determination in the manuscript is commendable; yet, the document's technical rigor needs significant work. It is critical to provide extensive explanations for the differences seen between trials, including probable contributors to these inconsistencies. Furthermore, the data should be compared to established findings in the standard literature to validate the results and offer a more solid scientific foundation for the study.	

### Review Form 3

<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>Need to be increased</b>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Need English check	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Most of the results are submitted to other sources need to check plagiarism using other tools	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shiva Prasad Uppu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Engineering, Ajeenkya D Y Patil University, India</b>