Tab 1

Results : Sentinel

Category A : Flight performance and payloads.

Category A1 (54/60)

I was PLEASANTLY Surprised! I mean, this thing is an absolute bloody dream to fly! It just does EXACTLY what you want it to do, and flawlessly so. For an Aircraft that really does not have any sort of relaxed stability or complex system, this thing manages flight performance amazingly! Unlike the other contenders on the list, this doesn't get a hit due to some G-Force reduction system, It takes a hit elsewhere, which I'll discuss below. But I was actually really impressed to see suchheavy fighter ACTUALLY pull off High G, 30+ degree turns. I mean seriously, the thing weighs 30 tonnes and can out-rate an F-15. NOW THAT IS IMPRESSIVE!

How do you improve the shortcomings?
Well, as much as I just glazed it for its outstanding turn rate... Sub 300 (Basically landing speeds) and it just feels slightly sluggish. VERY Slightly. I also take a big issue with how you've made the G-limiter an option considering that without it on, we did record a good 16 max at instantaneous. I mean, yeah, it quickly lowers, but then firstly it's so strong that it massively tanks everything I just praised at the cost of keeping the G's lower than 10, which it does do, but horribly so. Secondly, it's given as an option as if to say "You don't HAVE to die pulling 15-16, you know.) It should be on by default and NOT tank the pitch authority at low speeds, when it's not required.

Category A2 (38/40)

It's almost got it. ALMOST. It's just that close to perfect... just that close. It just occasionally decides that it's time to pull 15 now at high speeds if the G-Lim is off. The problem is there is a G-lim and it's an option, but there was no rule against that so I can't give it a lower score here because it does EXACTLY what you need it to. And especially when the G-Lim is on, it does it perfectly. You can dive this thing with the G-lim on and it will crash into the water and kill you but god forbid if it passes 10 G's **WHEN THE GLIM IS ON**

How do you improve the shortcomings?
Just spend more time on it, and you might get a perfect score! AND FOR CHRIST SAKE MAKE IT BUILT IN AND NOT AN OPTION IT IRKS ME SO MUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUCH ARGH You dummy you got an almost perfect score for this.

Category A3 (35/40)

Basically everything the exact same as the sparrow. Stall speed is at around 130mph, which is quite good, characteristics are also good, In very rare cases, slight snap rolling is observed and can be considered a risk, even though it very barely rolls. All in all, the airflow on both wings is managed decently. Stall recovery is excellent though, and is not an issue.

How do you improve the shortcomings?
Just spend more time on it. Find an even better wing geometry.)

Category A4 (2/20)
67,000 litres of fuel and he thought we wouldn't notice 😭 I mean, you were doing so well up till here, shifter 😢. I will be deducting a few points for the complete lack of aerial refuelling as well.

How do you improve the shortcomings?
You know... maybe DON'T put on an unrealistic amount of fuel?

Category A5 (0/40)
It... Unfortunately it doesn't exist. There is no VTOL.

How do you improve the shortcomings?
You don't. There is nothing to improve upon here.

Category A6 (48/50)
There is no major deviation from full combat load to Winchester in terms of flight performance. CoM barely moves which shows good balance, and over-all it's quite nice. Near perfect, even, once again.

How do you improve the shortcomings?
Just keep doing it this way and pay attention to it, and at some point, the balancing may become so good that you get a perfect score here which I must stress, I made it near impossible to get a perfect score in any category.

Final result for Category A : 177/250

Category B: Exterior Design and Engineering

Category B1 : 50/100
The first time I looked at it in the images, I thought it looked alright. Nothing special. I was gonna settle on 30-40. Then I opened it in the game and saw all the nuances... I was surprised. I started considering a 60, maybe even a 70. Then I took a closer look and honestly speaking, though it's a good looking plane... it is far from being well engineered. The build quality is good, but we take issue with the way it was made. Some areas, like the cockpit, though they have a lot of good building, don't feel coherent with each other. One thing isn't really leading to the next here. Like, the Canopy has this nice curve which should flow straight to the fuselage, but doesn't, instead looks hastily placed on top of it. That's sad because if the canopy assembly was moved a few inches further back it would have seemed like one, proper assembly. I was going to stop there with a 60... but then I looked at the wing assembly. Yikes. I commend you for trying, and it does seem like this custom wing assembly is far out of your comfort zone, so good work on taking up a challenge. It's not a horrendous job, but it definitely

feels like some of those flaps could fall right off. I'm all for keeping divisions, what I'm not for is having the flaps have a different angle than the ailerons, and noticeably so. I could have made an argument for 55 points, even then, but the airframe is far from being an ideal 6th gen. Other than hard edges, you didn't REALLY take it into consideration any other stealth principles here. One such principle is having quite a few 90* angles on the airframe. This is considered almost taboo.

How do you improve the shortcomings?
Research, Implementation, Practice, Time. You need to apply these. I'll always be here to nitpick. Make the designs you have more smooth, let them flow.

Innovative Exterior Solutions: 30/50
Hmm... I mean, the inlet grille is smart... If only it didn't tank realism... You do realize that grilles are VERY redundant, right? Other than that, I do like some things like the cockpit build, or the boxy engine cover tops... cool and all, nothing particularly new though.

How do you improve the shortcomings?
Get creative!!! Intentionally look for something unique to your build and only your build and then point it out next time!

Minimal Redundancy, Maximum Optimization: 20/50
Personally, this felt like it was very much an extremely ambitious, but under delivering airframe. You very clearly tried very interesting methods and shapes here, but It's likely your first time and it shows. Even worse if it isn't your first time. Your solution to hiding the weaker looking areas was to make them crowded. I just glazed the engine nacelles, and they really were fine, as long as I was still oblivious to what was inside. Why such complex geometry inside? Like there is another set of nacelles inside the nacelle. That's about 20 extra parts that the player will basically never see... and the central fuselage... What happened?? Why create so many divisions? You needed one for the centre line, two for the sides, but there are like... 5, some splitting it down halfway too for what seems like no proper reason.

How do you improve the shortcomings?
This is very important to you specifically, windshifter. You're potentially here was massively hindered because of this. There's a lot of tiny little things I found that alone make sense... but You've put them together in a rush and it shows. There was no real flow here, just many small things, each with pretty high performance cost for what the are smashed together. It does somewhat work, but needs a massive amount of refinement.

Functional Weapon System Integration: 65/100
It felt like a missed opportunity having only one missile type. Not like it was anything special either. That said, It was custom... so you still get points for that. Also, Unfortunately, the non-coherent building shows here too, in the weapon bay. It's sad how many builders in general are plagued by this.

How do you improve the shortcomings?
Very similar to everything else up till now. COHERENCE!!!! Anddddd also more variety would be nice

Final Result for Category B : 138/300

Category C: Interior Immersion and UI

Cockpit Functionality: 40/60

It's there... it works... but it's pretty basic... no? I mean, yes, there is a startup sequence and all, but stops at that. I was hoping for some more, good on you for keeping whatever is there well functioning. It's still a nice cockpit, especially if you ignore the fact that you can't see anything other than the main scream *Cough*

How do you improve its shortcomings?
Expand your skills here, this is one of your strong points.

Custom, Self-Made Screen Logic: 40/60

This is very nice. I like this, the screen concept is honestly beautiful, even if it is lacking. That throttle slider is so lovely that it alone deserved 30 points. I love it, I really do.

How do you improve its shortcomings?
...and it lacks in pretty much every other regard after that. There is massive potential here, it just needs to be used more and for more functions, like cycling through weapons and perhaps proper touchscreen selection interfaces. That would be incredible and could've scored you a massive boost in community value and innovation criteria.

Reusing and Customization of Existing Parts: 35/40

Really not that much recycling done here! Good work on keeping it original and re-using the HUD in an interesting way.

How do you improve its shortcomings?

A little more amazing work would be nice. The nitpicks that made it lose points are above.

Environment Change Reaction: 28/40
It reacts to normal flight conditions. That is all. There is also gear position, engine activation and missile arming, but nothing special really. Perhaps also the G-meter and the blue light add here... It could've had some way to warn us about angles of slip or attack, but we didn't even get stall warning. Sadge.

Overall: 143/200

Category D: History Making

Lore and Backstory: 10/40

Didn't get much, and whatever it did get, it did it in the most corporate, rinse and repeat method.

How do you improve its shortcomings?

Same as the criticism for the sparrow.

Visual Consistency: 23/30

Okay, there is definitely character here. You can tell, there was work put in here to make the paint scheme look unique... the only issue is, there is no story behind it.

How do you improve its shortcomings?
If the emblems had a little more meaning, we'd surely be having a different discussion right now.

Overall Realism: 5/30

Yeah... errr... This is a very fictional design. Let's put it that way. An airframe like this will never fly.

How do you improve its shortcomings?
You could and should have some references ready for this type of challenge. Simply making a cool design won't do!

Community Value: 85/150

I really like the idea of touch screens. Like, REALLLLLYYY like that. Do it more often, please. It's a cool concept, but right now, with how you executed it, the highlight to me is the throttle slider. That is it.

How do you improve its shortcomings?

Good concept, lack luster implementation. You can explore that Idea a little more in-depth.

Overall: 123/250

Final: 581/1000

A penalty of 5 points was applied. (You definitely didn't have the description ready for an extended period of time.)

A bonus of 5 points was applied. (A list was given personally about things improved upon from a previous design. This helped a little and showed care for the submission)

Final Notes : Another great aircraft if you ignore my ungrateful nitpicking. It should be noted that you gave a me list of changes that you said might add to the innovation points. For such a long list, there was nothing particularly of note in there.