This paper investigates that the effect of initial small-scale material nonlinearity on the pre-buckling response of externally pressurized general cross-ply as well as metallic (plane strain) perfect rings. The application involves a 16-node layer element with cylindrical curvature, assuming a quadratic displacement field in surface-parallel coordinates and a linear distribution of displacements through the layer thickness (LLDT). However, while the manuscript provides valuable insights, there are several areas where further clarification, refinement, and additional analysis could enhance the contribution to the existing body of knowledge. Here are some suggestions:

1. In lines 21, the use of the keywords "yield" and "buckling" in this section seems a bit redundant.
2. The title is recommended to be revised more accurately to represent the content and scope of the paper.
3. The formula layout is chaotic and there are problems with the image format and inconsistent font in Figs. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 5.
4. The literature review is insufficient. Please consider the following studies: Marine Struct, 90, 103424; Thin-Walled Struct, 183, 110370; Eng Struct, 282, 115780; Eng Struct, 252, 113670; Applied Ocean Res, 141, 103799; Marine Struct, 94, 103548.
5. In line 201, it is recommended that the author provide a more detailed explanation for the omitted content.
6. In lines 278, is the use of the 16-node layered element model (LLDT) reasonable for describing material nonlinearity? Are there other numerical models used for comparison to validate the accuracy of the results?
7. As shown in Figs. 7 and 8, why do the trends of the two exhibit opposite directions?
8. In lines 349-355, when approaching the buckling pressure, the pressure-strain curve of the ideal ring with initial small-scale material nonlinearity deviates by as much as 16.67%, and the deviation for its linear elastic response curve is 13.64%. What are the reasons for this deviation?
9. In lines 449-458, it is observed that the pressure-deflection curves resulting from the initial small-scale material nonlinearity exhibit differences of up to 21.07%

and 21.03%, respectively, compared to their linear elastic counterparts. How might these significant differences impact practical engineering applications?

10. The format and writing of the manuscript need to be rechecked.