

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_129548
Title of the Manuscript:	A review of research on porous structure negative Poisson's ratio metamaterials
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: 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>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The article offers a thorough assessment of studies on porous structure negative Poisson's ratio (NPR) metamaterials, which is of great significance to the scientific community. These materials have drawn a lot of interest because of their special mechanical qualities, which could lead to breakthroughs in a variety of domains, including materials science, engineering, and biomedical applications. This paper contributes to a better understanding of the behavior and applications of NPR metamaterials by offering different design methodologies and combining existing research. The assessment also identifies important issues and potential paths forward, which will help steer future advancements and theoretical advancements in the area.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is generally clear and suitable for a scientific article.	
<b>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.</b>	<b>the abstract is ok</b>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	It is in the line of science	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The ref. are sufficient but most of it are not recent	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English quality will be suitable if some typo error are put in shape.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>The manuscript is scientific inclined but some of the diagram are label in another language different from English. It should be worked on.</b>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Ohaegbue Anthony Dumebi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Nigeria</b>