Provide a sentence for each of the three following assessments:

1. Does the abstract topic fit within the themes of the conference? Yes

2. Is the content of the extended abstract scientific and technically sound? Can be improved.

3. Is the content of the extended abstract communicated well? Can be improved.

Based on the above three assessments, how do you rate the extended abstract on a scale of 1 to 5 where the numbers mean the submission should:

1: definitely be included as an oral presentation.
2: be included as an oral presentation.
3: be included as oral or poster presentation.
4: be included as poster presentation.
5: not be included in the conference program.

Your score: 3

If your score is a 5, please provide an extra statement explaining why the submission should not be included in the conference:

If the abstract needs minor improvements for publication in the book of abstracts, list the minor revisions required: Is the approach applicable to racebikes only? It seems like no. Therefore, no need to stress “racebike” by writing the term two times in the title. The practical usage of the diagram should be explained in the full paper (riding style? aero? lap-time? how?). The term “pure lateral movement” when \( \chi=0 \) is a bit misleading, b/c the bike is actually moving also in the longitudinal direction, although at constant speed. Typo on 7th line (dyNAmic). References: some refs related to similar or related works in addition to the PhD of the author would be good.