

### 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	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. Manuscript holds value for the scientific community as it addresses a critical aspect of aerodynamic optimization through dynamic camber variation.</li> <li>2. Focusing on the widely studied NACA 2412 airfoil and its Lift-to-Drag (L/D) ratio, it contributes to a deeper understanding of how geometric modifications can enhance aerodynamic efficiency.</li> <li>3. I appreciate the manuscript's clarity in hypothesis formulation and its practical approach, but further exploration of varying speeds and environmental conditions could enhance its applicability.</li> </ol>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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, the abstract is comprehensive, but adding details about the range of camber configurations and angles of attack tested would enhance clarity	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript is scientifically robust as it employs wind tunnel testing, a standard and reliable method for aerodynamic analysis, ensuring the accuracy of the Lift-to-Drag ratio measurements.</li> <li>2. The clear connection between camber variation, aerodynamic performance, and potential applications in adaptive wing technologies reflects a well-structured approach to bridging theoretical concepts with practical implementation.</li> <li>3. The study is technically sound and offers valuable insights into aerodynamic optimization.</li> </ol>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references can be added more but it is sufficient and recent.	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	---	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Subash Dhakal</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Anna University, Nepal</b>