

Paper title	Ducted Propulsors in Open Water - First steps towards their rational evaluation
Authors	Michael Schmiechen

Annotations:

• A factor of 2*pi is missing in the fifth equation on page 2.

The author of this paper shows a striking lack of modesty, which makes the paper a quite provoking read. The author should try to avoid paragraphs like "Although Dickmann and Weissinger (1955) already treated ducted propulsors as pumps they missed to note these fundamental facts (Schmiechen, 2003), which still contradict the 'instinctive beliefs' (Russell) of naval architects." Firstly, the author should be very careful with stating what is the 'instictive beliefs' of naval architects, since he doesn't know, and doesn't provide any documentation (the possible reference to Russell is missing)

Another example is the following paragraph: "Surprisingly naval architects do not use the hydraulic efficiency as performance criterion, except at the bollard condition, although the author has pointed out the advantage of the concept repeatedly since his contribution to Grim's paper at Berlin in 1966 and his paper on performance criteria presented at the ONR Symposium at Rome in 1968." Is it surprising that naval architect (who are they?) haven't read the authors papers? Or is it surprising that they don't agree with his ideas? The author might think so, but he should think twice, and not show his surprise so clearly in the paper.

I think the paper should use less space discussing what 'naval architects' think or do and more space on actually making the message clear.

This said, it is good that someone takes a fresh look at well established concepts, and the author is good at that.

Organisation Committee of the Second International Symposium on Marine Propulsors (SMP 2011) secretariat2011@marinepropulsors.com www.marinepropulsors.com

Moustafa Abdel-Maksoud Fon: +49-(0)40-42878 6053 Fax: +49-(0)40-42878 6055 E-mail: <u>m.abdel-maksoud@tu-harburg.de</u>