Dear colleagues,

many thanks for all your kind virtual cooperation. During my own continued thinking about the remaining inconsistencies in my re-evaluation of the 1987 quasi-steady model test I have detected a 'sign error' in one of the wake formulations. I am very sorry for this stupid mistake, once again confirming Murphy's Law, although this was clearly not the purpose of my exercise.

So much for the bad news I feel obliged to let you know. But before you shoot the messenger here is the good news. After correction of my mistake all the values obtained according to my method based on quasi-steady propulsion tests alone are in even closer, some in very (too?) close agreement with the values obtained according to the traditional procedure based on hull towing tests and propeller open water tests.

In principle this agreement is not necessary, but it is of course pre-requisite for the acceptance of my method by the community, not for nostalgic reasons but in view of the necessary references to past experience. The values of the energy wake fraction are still 'not quite' realistic. Future work has to start from here on, particularly in view of the scaling problem.

The check of plausibility of the wake axiom and the re-evaluation of the METEOR data have been updated accordingly. And all the updates are to be found under 'What's new?' on my website http://www.t-online.de/home/m.schm, which underwent some spring cleaning.

With many thanks for patiently watching my asymptotic approach to the goal I set forth more than two decades ago and looking forward to your further virtual, occasionally maybe actual support yours,

Michael Schmiechen.

PS. I am wondering who will be the first to take commercial advantage after the groundwork has been done.