

REVIEWS ON THE MANUSCRIPT [12]

Reviewer 1:

The paper is, admittedly, of reasonable quality. It already fulfills, in my eyes, the criteria that I applied to the other papers when preparing feedback.

The manuscript has the potential to be published.

Reviewer 2:

The structure is OK

Formula 1 needs to be amended.

This is a very good paper, thoroughly made with an interesting theoretical model and is highly recommended.

Editorial request:

“Spaghetti; as a brittle material”, page 1: check the use of the semicolon throughout the text.

“Although Behaviors of brittle rods”, page 1 : check the capital letters throughout the text.

“the behaviors and fracture of brittle material in respond to collision have been rarely investigated” : this statement is too strong. Clearly the fracture of brittle materials has been investigated in a plethora of publications. Consider a more accurate wording.

Consider emphasizing the novelty and contributions of the project in contrast to the ref. 1-6.

Ref. 8 : please put the references to this textbook in the text, not after the formulas.

Figures : Please use a blank spacing between the word Fig. and the number (Fig. 1. not Fig.1).

Ref. 7 : is this a book? Consider making the reference more accurate, at least with the details of the publisher.

This request was focused on the technical side of the manuscript and abstained from judging its physical essence.