

Flight Mechanics

Peer Review - Week 1

Paper by: Hamza Bouchouireb
Reviewer: Nikolaos Koukis

Thursday 5th February, 2015

1 Technical Work

Pros	Cons
(+) <i>Very good introductory part</i> , including general characteristics of aircraft but getting more specific when needed	(-) No proper α_{max} curve in the TEX Graph
(+) Thorough analysis of static performance, (maybe overanalyzing in the SEP Graph section)	(-) Captions of tables have to be as descriptive as the figures they correspond to ¹
(+) Optimization Part: <i>Actual goal is not stated in the introduction</i>	(-) "Some" more energy lines would have been useful to get the overall picture
(+) Good coherence between the theoretical analysis of the problem at hand and with historical facts, practical implementation etc.	
(+) Very analytical description of the mechanism of going supersonic	

2 Content - structure of report

Pros	Cons
(+) 2 column document - looks more formal	(-) Keep the same font, size between tables and main text
(+) Descriptive title	(-) Figure 8 is misplaced
(+) Very well structured report	(-) References section should have been included
(+) Useful keywords part	

3 Conclusions

Minor defects in the structure of the report but apart from that excellent overall quality especially for a draft version.

¹i.e do not use first, second etc but prefer repeating the actual goal (h = 11km, M = 1.5 ..)