1. Summary and Aim of the Study  
   The submitted article addresses a significant and timely issue: the optimization of aircraft wing aerodynamics under ground effect conditions, using lifting-line theory and the SLSQP optimization algorithm. The authors successfully combine a classical theoretical approach with a modern numerical implementation (MachUp Pro) to determine the optimal dihedral angle distribution that minimizes induced drag. The use of the mirror imaging method and the analysis of geometric parameters—such as ground clearance, aspect ratio, lift coefficient, and taper ratio—allow for the formulation of practical and clearly presented design conclusions.
2. Strengths of the Article  
   • Innovative combination of lifting-line theory with numerical optimization for ground effect analysis.  
   • Well-selected constraints in the optimization process (aerodynamic and geometric conditions), enhancing the realism of the results.  
   • Extensive parametric analysis: influence of various geometric and aerodynamic parameters on the optimal dihedral distribution.  
   • Practical value of the results – useful at the early design stages of GEV vehicles, with biological inspirations.  
   • Clear structure – logical layout, content consistency, and clearly formulated conclusions.
3. Suggestions and Recommendations (Minor Revision)  
   Although the article demonstrates a high substantive level, below are minor yet relevant editorial and content-related comments to consider before publication:

(a) Style and Language  
• Consider unifying the terminology – e.g., "dihedral angle," "dihedral," and "dihedral distribution" are used interchangeably; it would be beneficial to clarify and consistently use one term throughout the manuscript.  
• Reduce repetition in the conclusions section – for instance, the information on induced drag reduction for a wing with RA = 8 and h/b = 0.25 is repeated twice in similar wording.  
• Some paragraphs in the summary could be made more fluent by combining sentences and removing minor redundancies.

(b) Content Additions  
• A brief justification for selecting the SLSQP algorithm would be valuable – was its effectiveness compared with other optimization methods?  
• A general description of the control point mesh is missing – how many points were used and how were they distributed along the wing? This is essential for evaluating the model’s resolution.  
• It would be advisable to briefly mention the potential influence of viscosity – while lifting-line theory is based on potential flow, in real-world conditions deviations may occur.  
• Including illustrations or graphs (if not already present in the full version) showing example dihedral distributions or drag variation versus h/b would increase accessibility and the impact of the article.

1. Summary and Editorial Decision  
   The article represents a valuable and original theoretical-numerical study with clear application potential in low-altitude aviation (GEVs, UAVs). The methodology is robust, and the results are logical and well-documented. The only remarks are cosmetic or clarifying in nature and do not affect the overall scientific value of the work.  
   Final recommendation – minor revision – small editorial corrections and additions as indicated above are advised before publication.

Detailed Comments on the Manuscript Content:  
The manuscript submitted for review is very well organized. The structure, length, choice of topic, justification for addressing the topic, and its development are all sound. The authors properly define the problem, solve it, discuss the results obtained, and draw appropriate conclusions.  
I have no substantive comments on the manuscript – it is very well structured. The remarks below pertain to editorial aspects of the manuscript, and I recommend addressing them to further improve the quality of the scientific paper.

* The word “work” should not be used in scientific writing. Preferred terms include “manuscript,” “paper,” “study,” “article,” or “scientific article.” I suggest making the appropriate changes throughout the text.
* The abstract needs restructuring – please modify it so that it does not include results or a description of research methods. An abstract should encourage the reader to explore the paper and indicate its subject in no more than 5–6 sentences.
* The introduction is appropriate; however, it lacks several illustrations depicting the current state of the art. Such graphics can be self-developed based on source literature or cited from existing sources. Adding these would enhance the quality of the paper. This is not mandatory but recommended.
* All units in figures and tables should be written in square brackets – not in round brackets, nor after a dash or slash. I recommend consistently using square brackets for units. Please revise the manuscript accordingly.
* Axis labels in figures and graphs should be standardized – same size, same font type, etc. Please consider applying this to your work – it will certainly improve the quality of an already good paper.
* I have no comments on the references. The authors cite numerous scientific articles and present the information contained in them very well.
* The nomenclature section should be expanded. It is currently very limited. A complete list of abbreviations, notations, and symbols should be included. This can be placed at the end of the paper. This addition is necessary. The authors should also introduce symbolic notations for some of the calculated quantities – this is expected in scientific publications at the level of journals such as *Applied Sciences* (MDPI).
* The final conclusions are appropriate, and the authors have indicated directions for future research in the manuscript. I have no objections in this regard. However, it is recommended to add suggestions for applying the conclusions derived from the research to solving engineering or industrial problems – especially in the design or prototyping of aircraft or perhaps UAV drones.
* In some cases, figures and charts require attention – they should be in vector quality. Currently, they are not. I encourage improving this aspect. The authors should prepare these in dedicated software such as Grapher or Origin. MS Excel is not recommended.

This study has tremendous potential. It is worth presenting it to the scientific community. However, it requires some revisions before publication.  
Please submit the revised manuscript for another round of review.  
I suggest: minor revision.