

Final Project — Peer Review Form

B-21 Penetrating-Strike Route Planning Under Integrated Threat

Reviewer: _____

Date: _____

Author / paper ID: _____

Review (circle): **#1** in class, L39 **#2** before L40

How to review. Read the whole draft once before you mark anything. Then, for each rubric line, circle *one* band and write *one* specific comment: where (page, section, figure or equation), what you see, and what would fix it. Open two of the author's cited lessons for the citation check. Return the form through the course Teams team as a PDF — a scan of this sheet or an annotated copy of the file.

Bands. *Exceeds* — complete, correct and clearly argued, beyond what the task requires. *Meets* — complete and correct. *Developing* — present, but incomplete, unclear, or with errors. *Missing* — not in the draft.

How your reviews are graded. Your two reviews are the rubric's *Peer reviews given* line: **10% of your own Final Project grade**. Each review is graded on being **specific** (every comment points at a page, section, figure or equation), **accurate** (right about the models, the numbers and the rubric), and **anchored to the rubric** (each comment sits on its line, and the band you circle matches what you wrote). “Looks good” and “add more detail” earn nothing.

1 Threat picture (T1, T4, T6) (15 pts)

The contour for a stated heading (nose-on/worst case optional), MEZ and LEZ, EWR coverage, gaps and seams named; the passive network's DRMS along the route; the pop-up: straight leg vs the given left and right doglegs, CRLB DRMS and exposure for each, and the choice.

Where (page, section, figure or equation) — what you see — what would fix it	Exceeds	Meets	Developing	Missing

2 Route method and cost design (T3) (20 pts)

A directed grid with aspect-aware edge costs and the cost stated; the weight sweep and Pareto front; the fuel-limited choice; the aspect-blind route and its true P_S .

Where (page, section, figure or equation) — what you see — what would fix it	Exceeds	Meets	Developing	Missing

3 Survivability, support package, sensitivity and recommendation (T2, T5, R) (20 pts)

Each site's chain to p_{shot} , Δs and λ ; P_S for ingress and egress with the binding threat; the five given orbits evaluated by victim and SEAD site, one plan picked and defended (ΔP_S , the risk it leaves, its nearest rivals); one sensitivity (beamwidth or SEAD factor); the route to fly, its residual risk, and limitations that include an L37 trend.

Where (page, section, figure or equation) — what you see — what would fix it	Exceeds	Meets	Developing	Missing

4 Writing, figures and IEEE form (15 pts)

Sections in order; every figure cited in the text, its axes labeled with units; equations numbered; claims carry numbers; conclusions stay within the analysis; 4–5 pages, excluding the references and any appendix.

Where (page, section, figure or equation) — what you see — what would fix it	Exceeds	Meets	Developing	Missing

5 Course citations and sources (≥ 1 lesson per block) (10 pts)

At least one course lesson from each block (four or more), each cited in IEEE form for the specific claim it supports; any external source credible, publicly released, and vetted in one line in Appendix A.

Where (page, section, figure or equation) — what you see — what would fix it	Exceeds	Meets	Developing	Missing

6 Peer reviews given (specific, accurate, rubric-anchored) (10 pts)

Self-check, about this review of yours: before you submit, circle the band it earns and note the comment you would sharpen.

The comment on this form you would sharpen, and how	Exceeds	Meets	Developing	Missing

7 Response to reviewers (5 pts)

The author answers every reviewer comment at L41. Name the one comment on this form the author's response table most needs to answer.

Line number — the comment the author's response table must answer	not banded on a draft

8 Code reproducibility (5 pts)

From the draft: can you tell which script produced each figure and number, and with which parameters? (The code itself is graded at L41.)

Where (page, section, figure or equation) — what you see — what would fix it	Exceeds	Meets	Developing	Missing

Citation check

Blocks cited (circle): **1 2 3 4**

Pick two of the author's cited lessons that carry a claim the paper depends on, and open each one from the URL in its reference. Does the lesson support the claim it is cited for, where it is cited?

Ref.	Lesson	Claim it is cited for (page, section)	Opens?	Supports it?	Note
[]	L		Y N	Yes Partly No	
[]	L		Y N	Yes Partly No	

The strongest element of this paper — and where it is.

--

The single change that would most improve this paper — what, where, and why it matters most.

--