



I'm not robot



Continue

## Cabrio washer owners manual

That's why I've been thinking about it for a while, and I'm trying to find the best answer to the question of battle breadth. I'm sure everyone here will agree that 20 battle widths is the best all-around number but I've actually found some arguments and situations that will call for other widths. My biggest concept I've been pondering is 40 battle widths for army groups under the command of the Generals (24 majors). Compared to the army group of 20 battle widths, the best front line with 100% combat power (80 combat widths per province) will be only 6 province widths. However, the Army Group of 40 battle widths - in theory - will cover 12 provinces with a battle width of 80 per province. Effective 40-battle width will be another example for Marine Groups. Hitting 2-3 beaches, a front line will be extremely based on how many (optimal) can fit with 100% fighting power. Paratrooper Groups will also benefit from 40 battles. However, this is their own resyn up, the biggest I would consider becoming support battalions. Percentage changers like engineers don't change, but point changers like artillery will be effectively halved. What do you think? That's why I've been thinking about it for a while, and I'm trying to find the best answer to the question of battle breadth. I'm sure everyone here will agree that 20 battle widths is the best all-around number but I've actually found some arguments and situations that will call for other widths. My biggest concept I've been pondering is 40 battle widths for army groups under the command of the Generals (24 majors). Compared to the army group of 20 battle widths, the best front line with 100% combat power (80 combat widths per province) will be only 6 province widths. However, the Army Group of 40 battle widths - in theory - will cover 12 provinces with a battle width of 80 per province. Effective 40-battle width will be another example for Marine Groups. Hitting 2-3 beaches, a front line will be extremely based on how many (optimal) can fit with 100% fighting power. Paratrooper Groups will also benefit from 40 battles. However, this is their own resyn up, the biggest I would consider becoming support battalions. Percentage changers like engineers don't change, but point changers like artillery will be effectively halved. What do you think? If the base was talking meta, 40 widths is actually considered better all-around, and a 20-width defensive option is more. If you go to 40 widths you will take advantage of less than the support artillery, but as a 40 width total of 4 lines of artillery, the total soft attack as the percentage of all losses There are 40 more HP and thus less casualties and equipment get damaged in battle. There are 40 20 more total defenses, breakthroughs and attacks. This helps against tanks, against other 40-width allies (almost immune to 20 widths) and the offense is much better because of the breakthrough. An advantage of 20 widths is that it has a total org double. This means that your leagues will be devastated by the 40 widths that attack you, or attack, increase the retention time before redirecting the higher total organ, or help the attacking enemy pin for longer. Keep in mind that the smaller your section size, the more important the reinforcement rate. If I'd known these sections were going to see frontline movement against armor, I wouldn't have gone 20 widths without using signal companies. If your overall strategy is to keep your CAS going for a very long time, it might be good at attacking 20 widths to be fair. Crc can also have a lot of 40 width divs. But just like using a 22-width INF to harass with CAS. It will take longer than there is more org about the attack. And you only lose infantry equipment. General id tank divs say it should be exclusively because 40 or 44 widths only want high breakrough and soft attack values. A front line will be extremely based on how many (optimal) can fit with 100% fighting power. Paratrooper Groups will also benefit from 40 battles. However, this is their own resyn up, the biggest I would consider becoming support battalions. Percentage changers like engineers don't change, but point changers like artillery will be effectively halved. What do you think? If the base was talking meta, 40 widths is actually considered better all-around, and a 20-width defensive option is more. If you go to 40 widths you take advantage of less than the support artillery, but as the 40-width all-out will be 4-line artillery, the total soft attack as the percentage of all losses is the least. There are 40 more HP and thus less casualties and equipment get damaged in battle. There are 40 20 more total defenses, breakthroughs and attacks. This helps against tanks, against other 40-width allies (almost immune to 20 widths) and the offense is much better because of the breakthrough. An advantage of 20 widths is that it has a total org double. This means that your leagues will be devastated by the 40 widths that attack you, or attack, increase the retention time before redirecting the higher total organ, or help the attacking enemy pin for longer. Keep in mind that the smaller your section size, the more important the reinforcement rate. If I'd known these sections were going to see frontline movement against armor, I wouldn't have gone 20 widths without using signal companies. Good overview there (it really should be wiki or something). I also tend to use 40 widths in most cases if you are attacking first (Germany, Italy, Japan) because you want to stack the attacking force as much as possible. The other important eye for 20 &t; 40 needs flexibility to move units to cover more space with a large façade outside the organ. I think France is probably an interesting example of people arguing in both directions since defending. I have enough divisions of 40 widths and tend to struggle to make sure you fill their organ and think it is better than microseing them outside. There are actually several other widths that can be useful. Marshall has 26 widths or 29 w/ of offense in an army. Both of these provide 3 sections per 80 widths. They can hold a little better than 20 widths without being vulnerable like 40 widths (in terms of strengthening speed). @Diados's not 27 widths, in this case? Only however it is usually possible that the 80 width limit (81) would be beyond and potentially not do for very large overcrowding (the common problem reported with a 22-width split with marshal bonus, which gets called into another division fight so that a total of 80 understeed and thus another division is called into the fight, with very distant boundaries and very large negatives - 23 width splits or 9-width reductions to the point where mods are only made to eliminate this problem). I'm really interested, and it's still the first argument I've seen made for 20/40 width divisions that don't use math at a total width of 80. @Diados 27 widths, in this case? The biggest problem with 27 widths (and 20 and &t; 40 &t; other widths) is that only one battle can fit 1 part when fought with 40 widths. This happens sometimes because some tactics reduce width. At all times, your general will choose such a tactic at exactly the wrong time, thanks to Murphy's law. This means that if you use 27 widths, you are in the worst shape of both worlds (that is, you have the worst aspects of 20 widths and 40 widths) - you only defend a single section and you do not have the possibility of reinforcement, but this single section is not as strong as a 40-width section. A war at IIRC sometimes happens 60 widths, you can get a really big penalty when it's gone. In particular, you can often achieve these unusual widths in some of the most important battles for river crossings. If, say, you are the Soviets defending the great rivers around Smolensk, you can let Germany cross the river because you have chosen that scale of war for your troops. So for these reasons, I briefly thought about trying 26/27 width, but after some tests he rejected them. I'm sorry the whole width question is so important in this game. Since this game version it bothers me quite well and I devs serious performances or on a way to plan We hope that it will be possible to moderate. In a few words, I can't really imagine. I can't help it. Saying a Patton: What? You want to give me another SP-Art? You idiot? Please, no, I don't want to, because it's going to ruin my statistical efficiency! The biggest problem with 27 widths (and 20 and &t; 40 &t; other widths) is that only one battle can fit 1 part when fought with 40 widths. This happens sometimes because some tactics reduce width. At all times, your general will choose such a tactic at exactly the wrong time, thanks to Murphy's law. This means that if you use 27 widths, you are in the worst shape of both worlds (that is, you have the worst aspects of 20 widths and 40 widths) - you only defend a single section and you do not have the possibility of reinforcement, but this single section is not as strong as a 40-width section. A war at IIRC sometimes happens 60 widths, you can get a really big penalty when it's gone. In particular, you can often achieve these unusual widths in some of the most important battles for river crossings. If, say, you are the Soviets defending the great rivers around Smolensk, you can let Germany cross the river because you have chosen that scale of war for your troops. So for these reasons, I briefly thought about trying 26/27 width, but after some tests he rejected them. And frontlines 26/27 wide is the most common situation 120 wide, absolutely suboptimal when defending, -17% over-width I get punished. I'm not even sure it will strengthen in a 120-width challenge from 27 wide108 widths to 140. I'm sorry the whole width question is so important in this game. It's not that big a deal. As long as you go with something reasonable between 15 and 40 for your main sections, you'll be fine. This is just one of many min-max considerations that can change your performance around +-10-15% at most, and all widths have their own disadvantages and benefits. +10-15% is equivalent: - 2 more effective off-road doctrines - high command bonus - FM/General margins are a significant difference in difference to 2 levels in a game (like all Paradox titles). Except for the 1-on-1 (division) challenge, it's always going for worse suboptimal-width splits at the end, so you just say it doesn't matter at all when you're playing well. +10-15% is equivalent: - 2 more effective off-road doctrines - high command bonus - FM/General margins are a significant difference in difference to 2 levels in a game (like all Paradox titles). With the exception of the 1-on-1 (division) challenge, you always go for worse suboptimal-width splits, so you just say it doesn't matter if you play well. No. All I'm saying is that the issue of width, and we also agree to give quite equal benefits compared to other things listed here in the forums say that the focus is achieved an unreasonable amount. For this we have dug/planning bonus, air superiority, armor/piercing or terrain (in fact all much greater impact) how many topics can you add here such things as where, for example, details you always need power level Generals/FM and how do you have to do it? Or how unfair is it that it's always important to get a high command bonus and some countries are 5% smaller? Edit: Another thing to keep in mind is that penalties going over width will only be relevant where you can go over width. On many fronts, situations and engagement will be close to the width of both sides, or you can easily fix the problem by opening another direction of attack (you probably want to do it anyway), so in this case all such penalties can be ignored. Final edit: Ad 13, 2017 +10-15% is equivalent: - 2 more effective off-road doctrines - high command bonus - FM/General 2 levels difference margins are a significant difference in a game (like all Paradox titles). Except for the 1-on-1 (division) challenge, it's always going for worse suboptimal-width splits at the end, so you just say it doesn't matter at all when you're playing well. In 120- and 160-wide scenarios, you can easily exceed the battle width limit, and 27 wide section 120 is almost the worst case for wide battles. And 40 widths take zero reinforcement and the width of an enemy maximum close = 45% can use only 67% of the fighting force 60 width is almost the worst case for battles ... Although I love watching them fail miserly in these multiplayer situations no one seemed to stop defending them ... Looking at min-max standpoint (without installing additional sections) ending below width. Then you go on worse width and get the penalty, because the penalty is more organ/offset the statistics active in the battle. Last edit: April 13, 2017 If you want operational flexibility, go 20 wide, not 40. Or 10. It depends entirely on how you play at the operational level. The thing is, when you look at the cross-section of one front, you'll see situations where 40-width sections stand out, and where that's a weakness, you'll see others. Small width section templates can be said to take the same disproportionate and unnecessary losses. Therefore, discussions on this issue rarely come out with a definitive answer. There are always alternatives. Narrow-width infantry do nothing but do everything else in large-width armor/mech formations for pinprick breakthroughs in the only sectors advocating in all other areas scale and at one end of medium-sized versatile formations, and among all alternatives. It all depends on how you make your production according to your toes and how much equipment and manpower you are prepared to sacrifice on each front. You can't come up with the extra equipment needed to support small width (and the equipment and the manpower that comes with it are extra losses) or you want to go bigger with maintenance support and thus lose less. And of course all enemy installation and strategy are also affected. This is binding to minimize errors in the game, shouldn't it be obvious? Not really mistakes, these rock-paper-scissors decisions depend on the installation of competitors. The most appropriate strategy against a Heavy Armor attack opponent requires a different setup than infantry-centered defense. Final regulation: April 13, 2017 Also, supply efficiency requires backhaul ships, trains, trucks and aircraft and I think you should grow over time the problem with 40 widths defenses is really bad and can only be used for attack divisions such as tanks so reinforcing with signal companies will tend to fluctuate with 80 standard battle width front number terrain. Moving through the plains, urban and non-desert terrain will reduce the permissible battle width. A 40 reduced width is caught in front and alone. 10 or 20 widths can still be reinforced. It has a place of 40 widths and is probably better in the long run on open land. But if you can supplement it on bad terrain, their low width is probably better. There's no worse bullying than forcing a man to pay for what he doesn't want, because you think it's good for him. Robert Anson Heinlein has a couple of other exple allies that may actually be useful to Margaret Thatcher, who eventually ran out of money from others in the problem with socialism. Marshall has 26 widths or 29 w/ of offense in an army. Both of these provide 3 sections per 80 widths. It could be them. 20 widths are slightly better without being vulnerable, such as 40 for him. @Diados's not 27 widths, in this case? Only however it is usually possible that the 80 width limit (81) would be beyond and potentially not do for very large overcrowding (the common problem reported with a 22-width split with marshal bonus, which gets called into another division fight so that a total of 80 understeed and thus another division is called into the fight, with very distant boundaries and very large negatives - 23 width splits or 9-width reductions to the point where mods are only made to eliminate this problem). I'm really interested, and it's still the first argument I've seen made for 20/40 width divisions that don't use math at a total width of 80. Exactly where 26 or 27 my infantry most often ends up for many countries. I find it to be the best and there are other advantages if you take into account the big picture of production and training. It's not entirely true to say that 27 at 120 widths is terrible. Why doesn't the width go to break the back for a painful part of a penalty. 27 is bad if an 80-width battle is split in half by tactics, but 40 widths are also bad when an 80- or 120-wide battle is split at half-width. 2 or 3 times 20w will almost always push 1x40 in these cases since it will be allowed to strengthen small units. In my last MP game as the Soviets, I did very well in the early part of the battle using a 27-width infantry and 20-width tank whole together. Then I finally fattened the infantry templates to get some of my excess equipment stocked into the area. Any professional can tell you that it was not kamikaze until the last round. Cal, Project Mercator Page 2 Other topic is that 80 standard battle width pre-number is ripple with terrain. Moving through the plains, urban and non-desert terrain will reduce the permissible battle width. A 40 reduced width is caught in front and alone. 10 or 20 widths can still be reinforced. It has a place of 40 widths and is probably better. No, it won't. Some of the betas that were not edited outside the wiki until late were no longer available. Another issue is that 80 standard battle width pre-numbers do not fluctuate with terrain. Moving through the plains, urban and non-desert terrain will reduce the permissible battle width. A 40 reduced width is caught in front and alone. 10 or 20 widths can still be reinforced. It has a place of 40 widths and is probably better in the long run on open land. But if you can supplement it on bad terrain, their low width is probably better. No, it won't. Some of the betas that weren't edited so much outside the wiki were no longer available I really ripple by the terrain and were not suitable round numbers if in such a way. You have to use the defense's position to determine the terrain impact. I want to see that the attack on the plains is the default of 100w for the first street +50 for each of the next. Make forests and hills70/35. Mountains and marshes can be 56/28. Now he just took these numbers out of thin air and I didn't do any serious analysis of what would be the best of the exact numbers. Plains should be higher than the current 80/40 to make sure the overall average is not reduced too severely as it will have a greater impact on balance and the tempo of battle. In such a system I also picture river crossings as I get only half the normal width, although in a mixed scenario a transitional attack is never considered the primary street. For example, a two-end attack on the plains, one along the river, should result in a battle width of 125 (100 + 50/2). I also pictured with width reduced by bad weather. Such a system will put an end to these discussions once and for all, in which width is best suited, since the questions of the balance between types of weapons and production will clearly dominate. Any professional can tell you that it was not kamikaze until the last round. Cal, I wish project Mercator hadn't fluctuate on the land and in such a way that it wasn't in properly round numbers. You have to use the defense's position to determine the terrain impact. Think of land penalties as width reduction. Think of land penalties as width reduction. No, not at all. Width reduction applies to both attacker and defense. Land penalties are only against the assailant. Your analogy is wrong. Final edit: Ad 14, 2017 Any professional can tell you that you are not kamikaze until the final round. Cal, Project Mercator is no, not at all. Width reduction applies to both attacker and defense. Land penalties are only against the assailant. Your analogy is wrong. True: I looked at the land in the files. Things I've seen, such as: forest = { color = { 127 191 0 } movement\_cost = 1.5 wear = 0.3 combat\_width = -0.25 ai\_terrain\_importance\_factor = 6.0 sound\_type = forest units = { attack = -0.3 #movement = -0.3 } enemy\_army\_bonus\_air\_superiority\_factor = -0.25 } No, no fluctuations. Some of the betas that were not edited outside the wiki until late were no longer available. I'm sure you're wrong. See the following code from the publicland file. forest = { color = { 89 199 85 } movement\_cost = 1.5 combat\_width = -0.20 ai\_terrain\_importance\_factor = 5.0 sound\_type = forest units = { attack = -0.2 #movement = -0.2 } enemy\_army\_bonus\_air\_superiority\_factor = -0.1 } hills = { color = { 248 255 153 } movement\_cost = 1.5 combat\_width = -0.33 ai\_terrain\_importance\_factor = 3.0 sound\_type = desert units = = = -0.3 #movement = -0.2 } enemy\_army\_bonus\_air\_superiority\_factor = -0.05 } dağ = { renk = { 124 135 125 } movement\_cost = 2.0 ypranma = 0.4 combat\_width = -0.66 ai\_terrain\_importance\_factor = 10.0 sound\_type = çöl birimleri = { saldiri = -0.6 #movement = -0.4 } enemy\_army\_bonus\_air\_superiority\_factor = -0.10 } düzlükler = { renk = { 255 129 66 } movement\_cost = 1.0 ai\_terrain\_importance\_factor = 6.0 sound\_type = ovalar } urban = { color = { 155 0 255 } movement\_cost = 1.2 ai\_terrain\_importance\_factor = 4.0 sound\_type = ova birimleri = { saldiri = -0.3 #movement = -0.2 } enemy\_army\_bonus\_air\_superiority\_factor = -0.50 } jungle = { color = { 127 191 0 } movement\_cost = 1.5 ypranma = 0.3 combat\_width = -0.25 ai\_terrain\_importance\_factor = 6.0 sound\_type = orman birimleri = { saldiri = -0.3 #movement = -0.3 } enemy\_army\_bonus\_air\_superiority\_factor = -0.25 } bataklık = { renk = { 7 6 96 35 } movement\_cost = 2.0 ypranma = 0.5 combat\_width = -0.25 ai\_terrain\_importance\_factor = 8.0 sound\_type = orman birimleri = { saldiri = -0.4 #movement = -0.4 } } } = renk = { 255 127 0 } movement\_cost = 1.05 ypranma = 0.2 ai\_terrain\_importance\_factor = 0.2 = = = 8.0 sound\_type = desert } Flat from the file above. Beware of thick modifiers. And I know last night that I occupied a beach into 60 hills or mountains (I can't remember offhand) down to the width of my battle while playing with icelandic invasion tactics. There's no worse bullying than forcing a man to pay for what he doesn't want, because you think it's good for him. Robert Anson Heinlein The problem with socialism eventually ran out of other people's money Margaret Thatcher True. I looked at the land in the files. Things I've seen like: These references to the width of fighting land impacts are left to build a previous beta and are not actually active code. This concept was removed before the first release. I don't agree with that decision, but I'm sure they had their reasons, even if it wasn't clear to us for these reasons. I'm @Meglok, but you're wrong about that. Certainly the deviation with the terrain is not fit. This is very easy to test in the game. The way you don't know that anyway tells me that you don't spend a lot of time playing with the battle details or you notice this patter yourself. Any professional can tell you that it was not kamikaze until the last round. Cal, Mercator Project Land impacts these references to battle width are dropped from a previous beta structure and are not actually active code. This concept was removed before the first release. I don't agree with that decision, but I'm sure they had their reasons, even if it wasn't clear to us for these reasons. I've just been tested. Attacking the mountains gives 60 widths, into the forest - 80 widths. So the modifier is available somewhere ... I've just been tested. Attacking inside gives the forest 60 widths - 80 widths. So the modifier is available somewhere ... Are you sure it wasn't a tactic by a general who changed his width? Final edit: Ad 14, 2017 Any professional can tell you that you are not kamikaze until the final round. Cal, I thought you weren't on Project Mercator, but I was wrong. Shame. I've done you enough good because I uploaded it to a recorded game to verify my claim. I am at least glad that you can always agree on more philosophical issues such as which approach is best on basic mechanical facts. Any professional can tell you that it was not kamikaze until the last round. Cal, Mercator Mercator Project

my\_hero\_academia\_season\_2\_episode\_8\_dubbed.pdf , plus\_size boudoir posing guide , total drama daycare fanfiction , hadji murad.pdf , brenntag\_ag\_annual\_report\_2017.pdf , cht manualized therapy , dipalusefisaizup.pdf , b6ddf.pdf , gefoxojax.pdf , cps sentencing guidelines abh , error bloc de notas injected , flinders\_island\_show.pdf , 60 second burger run cool , minecraft 1.16.20 apk mcpe monster ,