KTH ROYAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING SCIENCES

Flight Mechanics Peer Review - Project 2

Paper by: Boban Pavlovic **Reviewer:** Nikolaos Koukis

1 Technical Work

Pros	Cons
(+)Figure (2) is quite expanatory	(-) What about the dynamic pressure limit? It should have been stated and plotted in the excess thrust graph since the graph include the negative values
(+)Values for $C_{l\beta}, C_{lp}$ seem quite reasonable	(-) Equation (2.5) should correspond to $\dot{\phi}$ instead of ϕ (-) Procedure of calculating $C_{l\beta}$ is not given (-) No mathematical proof whatsoever on why the specific equations are used (-) Why does the $v-\xi$ curve increases goes up as the ξ values increase?

2 Content - structure of report

Pros	Cons
	(-) High frequency of syntax
	vocabulary language mistakes
	(-) aircraft's motion → motion of the aircraft
	(-) (p.4 par.3) L is defined positive
	in a clockwise motion from the pilot
	fuselage point of view
	(-) (Fig. 7) squar \rightarrow squares
	(-) SEP graph is cropped at 16 km al
	tude. The maximum altitude is act
	ally higher by a small fraction
	(-) State the goals for optimization
	the actual SEP graph (where do v
	want the aircraft to reach)
	(-) Only 1 optimization case is e
	plained. What about the rest?
	(-) More insight should have been
	given on the notion of the exce
	thrust and power.
	(-) Rushed report especially in term
	of form.
	(-) Classical introduction "With the j
	era starting"
	(-) Tough for the reader to follow
	(-) Equations $(1.1) \rightarrow Mark$ them different differential equations

3 Overall Impression

Although the final results seem to be logical many of the steps included in their computation are not properly explained. The format of the report as well as the language syntax and vocabulary are inappropriate for this kind of document and should be modified and do not help the reader in understanding the content of the paper.