RELEVANT COMMENTS

All the assumptions are logical and valid. However, please elaborate assumptions more, as they form an important part of a report (also for the final report): explain *why* it is valid to make the assumption (e.g. why is it valid to model the aileron as a beam), and explain what the effect is, also on the accuracy (will it over- or underestimate). Please do this for all assumptions, as this is now largely lacking.

Please clearly distinguish between assumptions that you make in general about the aileron, and assumptions that are specific to your numerical model.

Furthermore, you've implicitly made some assumptions that you did not write down (particularly for the numerical model). My best advice would be think of what equations would you need to solve the *full* problem with all its intricacies (without worrying about how you would solve those), and then compare with what you're actually gonna be solving, and then think about all of the simplifications you've made (and then clearly explain what the effect is of those simplifications/assumptions).

Reference Frame is good. However, not fully consistent with text: in remainder of text, you sometimes use xyz to refer to rotated coordinate system.

**VERIFICATION**

It's good that you looked for general techniques of verification (e.g. black- and white-box approach). However, you could have been more specific in the tests you describe. For example, the unit testing never goes into detail how you are going to test certain units of the program (just that you change variables etc. but never really specific).

**For the final report, please make sure you describe accurately how you verify everything,** and clearly state what results you get (i.e. don't make the same mistake of being vague and saying "We verified it", but also provide the results of it (so specific numbers)).

Practically equivalent and 0.05 margin are quite different from each other. Usually unit tests should be at in the order of machine precision. (motivate the numbers)

Note that more system tests exist than just comparing with the given analytical model. Can you e.g. change some of the input variables such that the problem turns into a standard problem of which the standard solution is known (or else easily computed by hand)?

**VALIDATION**

I like how you came up with different ways to validate a program and that you are going to use the multiple provided validation sets to gain better insight in what causes discrepancies. Nonetheless, make sure for the final report that you are specific about how you validate exactly (i.e. what error do you analyse (what parameter exactly do you analyse and how do you define the error)), and pay more attention to what may cause these discrepancies.

You've looked up additional information on validation techniques, which is good. However, again, some things are not very specific: how do you define the error for example? There are many ways to define an error (average error, standard deviation, maximum error, etc.).

7.2.2 Formal Validation Techniques

You misinterpreted what the different loading conditions represent (it's simply that P and q are set equal to 0, for the rest all we change is the deflection angle theta (setting it to minus theta)), but indeed, looking at the different ones to analyse what may cause differences is a very good idea!

For the final report, try to be more specific in what assumptions (both your own and assumptions made in the validation model) are important in explaining the discrepancies.

