Peer Review for Nikolaos Koukis
Reviewer: Sathyanarayanan Chandramouli

TECHNICAL WORK

The project work has covered most of the major aspects of the project description.There is a valid reasoning employed in developing the subject content of project-2,though the governing equations and required assumptions for the project-1 could be stated for the sake of clarity to the reader.
As stated, the work in project-1 could be developed in a way that theory and methods are explained separately and elaborately, along with the necessary assumptions describing the simplified models.
The author has commented appropriately when necessary on the accuracy of the results in Project-1
In the climb to the maximum altitude, the author could obtain better accuracy in results by climbing along the peaks of the SEP graph. Results have been presented for the evaluation of C_{lp} in the second project, but the methodology followed was a little unclear,especially the part presenting the velocity-Damping approximation curve vaguely leading to the calculation of C_{lp} . The methodology could be elaborated for the sake of clarity, in the final version of the report. The results obtained for C_{lp} seem to be reasonable.The evaluation of $C_{(l\beta)}$ seems to be in progress.

CONTENT

An abstract does not seem important currently, but may be required to be drafted before the submission of the final draft. The title reflects the content of the report, but could state more precisely the sections of the project. The introduction is a very nice read, and coveys several facts unknown to the reviewer. The author could focus on having a separate section detailing the theory and methodolgy used for the project-1 and an elaborate presentation of the methodology section for project part-2. A list of references has been made, and the paper cites all important sources of work.

STYLE

The author has conveyed ideas clearly, and most of the necessary figures and graphs seem to be presented. The graphs for the state and control variables for the climb to maximum mach number and maximum altitude could be included in the final version of the report. All figures and graphs seem to be appropriately labelled, and numbered. Pages of the report have been numbered, a list of nomenclature could be included in the final version of the report. A section to all relevant references has been included by the author.

OVERALL IMPRESSION

The author has drafted the report on LaTex, making it very professional in appearance. Sometimes there seems to be an appearance of **“??”** when citing previous sections, which could be corrected for the final version. The reviewer appreciates the presentation of a very readable derivation of the governing equation in project-2, but also recommends an inclusion of such a step by step description in part-1 as detailed earlier. Overall it was a very good work, given the constraints on time.