

Nothing Gets a

Ten...

or

The Reviewer's Guide to marking a review kit

About a year ago, when W3MH started doing serious reviews, we produced a simple guide to help decide on a machine's final mark. There are magazines around that almost always give a machine high marks, the most classic example being a Japanese manual being given an 80% score in a review written in English. We wanted our reviews to mean something...



To get a 10 the helicopter would have to have a completely finished canopy in the colours of choice, a selection of the 5 best sets of blades in the world, it would have to climb like an Atlas rocket and fly completely axial rolls. It would have to have an onboard computer capable of deciding when the pilot was out of control, whatever the pilot thought, so it could take over and land safely - at his feet. Nothing gets a 10...



This is a breathtaking machine; it's beautifully engineered, all the parts fit 100% perfectly and the control system is completely slop free. It can easily be adapted to different styles of flying, states of competence, engines and radio gear. The spares are realistically priced and readily available. It flies completely precisely and predictably. Technical support is readily available. It's probably unjustifiably expensive, which means it would get an 8. It's very hard to get a nine!



There's some thing or two that holds this back from being a 9. It's a very good machine, but something could be better. Perhaps a part was missing, but quickly replaced. Maybe one of the fits was wrong, or it wouldn't balance out properly. It would tend to be a very high quality machine with a few annoying, limiting or silly things on it, or maybe there's a quirk in the flying which seemed out of character.

An only slightly irreverant view of kit reviews...

There are many aspects of a review contributing to a final mark out of 10. Here's some things which may figure in the final score:

- Build quality*
- Component quality*
- Ease of completion*
- Complexity of maintenance*
- Spares cost*
- Reliability*
- Safety*
- Flight performance*
- Initial outlay*
- Value for money*



This is a very good all round machine, but there are a few shortcomings or compromises. Some aspect of the flying might not have been right.



This is a nice machine, and has a lot to commend it. It's above average generally, or has potential with some minor changes, but has a few niggly points.



This has the potential to be right and what's right already is properly done. It's mid range, nothing particularly stands as out as being desperately bad or good. It's a perfectly competent machine.

4

This is not a really bad helicopter, but there are areas where it's really not right and little can be done by the owner. It comes something like right in the end, but there's a lot of work or cost involved.

3

There are some merits in this helicopter, but they are generally outweighed by the disadvantages or problems. You would have to have a good reason to buy this, but there may be some areas where it would be usable.

2

It wouldn't go together right, or there was some major problem. It could be dangerous, or very unreliable. It really can't be recommended for purchase.

1

To get only 1 out of 10 the helicopter would arrive with some vital part or parts missing, These would be out of stock for some critical time. There would be major problems with assembly, fits, meshes, weight, strength and/or safety. Something would fall off it with amazing regularity - while in the back of the car on the way to the field. It would only get airborne for a brief period before some catastrophic event occurred, resulting in (hopefully) it's complete destruction. The reviewer should be compensated and probably hospitalised.

tony wright

W3MH past review models



With apologies to *Monthly Harpoons and Widgets*