Casualties by Martin Rapier

Thanks - the rules turned up last night. Interesting to retrofit the troop densities, movement rates etc. against historical operations (I'm working on a multi-corps level scenario for Epsom at the moment).

I'm not sure for Korea that I'd both halve the unit effectiveness and double the losses for NK forces - one or other is probably sufficient, particularly if using the 'infantry battalions as support' option which is going to bump up the NK losses hugely.

An interesting option for different command types might be to change the planning times for certain types of operation - mission directed type C2 systems maybe faster for encounters/counterattacks etc, central command type systems worse at lower level ops or maybe they have to use drills or something.

the suggested on halving the combat effectiveness for N. Korean troops and doubling their casualties was taken from Depuy's QJM model. However, using infantry as support options will create the same effect as doubling their casualties, therefore it could be removed except in the case of a single N Korean infantry battalion attacking.

Sure, I realise that - it is very easy to accidently double count CEV modifiers though. Richard Brooks did just the same thing in Minischlacht, attempting to create a 4:1 combat outcome difference between the Austrians and Prussians but actually producing an 8:1 difference, which was a tad unfair!

Apportioning losses to all the engaged units is a very effective way of representing the apalling losses suffered by mass attacks from poorly trained but numerous formations, conversely extremely effective formations (like say the Israelis vs the Egyptians in 67) can fight there way to victory with minimal losses. I use the same system in panzergruppe, but Jerry Ellsmore hates it (as for some odd reason he often seems to end up with all the lousy infantry) - they do recover much faster than elite formations though.