

## OE-D-22-02830: Decision

---

Dari: Ocean Engineering (em@editorialmanager.com)

Kepada: k\_suastika@yahoo.com

Tanggal: Kamis, 13 Oktober 2022 20.18 WIB

---

Manuscript No.: OE-D-22-02830

Title: A practical empirical formula for the calculation of ship added friction-resistance due to (bio)fouling

Article Type: Full length article

Corresponding Author: Dr. Ketut Suastika

All Authors: Muhammad Luqman Hakim; Ketut Suastika; I Ketut Aria Pria Utama

Submit Date: Aug 11, 2022

Dear Dr. Suastika,

The reviewers have commented on your above paper submitted to Ocean Engineering. I would be grateful if you could address the comments by the reviewers given below and resubmit your revised manuscript by Nov 03, 2022.

Please carefully address the issues raised in the comments. If a reviewer indicates that comments were uploaded in a separate file, this can be found by clicking "View Reviewer Attachments" under "Action Links" on your Author Main Page.

When you are submitting a revised manuscript, please also:

a) outline each change made (point by point) as raised in the reviewer comments

AND/OR

b) provide a suitable rebuttal to each reviewer comment not addressed

To submit your revision, please do the following:

1. Go to: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/oe/>

2. Enter your login details

3. Click [Author Login]

This takes you to the Author Main Menu.

4. Click [Submissions Needing Revision]

When submitting your revised manuscript, please ensure that you upload the source files (e.g. Word). Uploading only a PDF file at this stage will create delays should your manuscript be finally accepted for publication.

If your revised submission does not include the source files, we will contact you to request them.

Please note that this journal offers a new, free service called AudioSlides: brief, webcast-style presentations that are shown next to published articles on ScienceDirect (see also <http://www.elsevier.com/audioslides>). If your paper is accepted for publication, you will automatically receive an invitation to create an AudioSlides presentation.

PLEASE NOTE: Ocean Engineering would like to enrich online articles by displaying interactive figures that help the reader to visualize and explore your research results. For this purpose, we would like to invite you to upload figures in the MATLAB .FIG file format as supplementary material to our online submission system. Elsevier will generate interactive figures from these files and include them with the online article on SciVerse ScienceDirect. If you wish, you can submit .FIG files along with your revised submission.

Ocean Engineering features the Interactive Plot Viewer, see: <http://www.elsevier.com/interactiveplots>. Interactive Plots provide easy access to the data behind plots. To include one with your article, please prepare a .csv file

with your plot data and test it online at <http://authortools.elsevier.com/interactiveplots/verification> before submission as supplementary material.

Include interactive data visualizations in your publication and let your readers interact and engage more closely with your research. Follow the instructions here: <https://www.elsevier.com/authors/author-services/data-visualization> to find out about available data visualization options and how to include them with your article.

#### Research Elements (optional)

This journal encourages you to share research objects - including your raw data, methods, protocols, software, hardware and more – which support your original research article in a Research Elements journal. Research Elements are open access, multidisciplinary, peer-reviewed journals which make the objects associated with your research more discoverable, trustworthy and promote replicability and reproducibility. As open access journals, there may be an Article Publishing Charge if your paper is accepted for publication. Find out more about the Research Elements journals at [https://www.elsevier.com/authors/tools-and-resources/research-elements-journals?dgcid=ec\\_em\\_research\\_elements\\_email](https://www.elsevier.com/authors/tools-and-resources/research-elements-journals?dgcid=ec_em_research_elements_email).

I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Atilla Incecik  
Editor-in-Chief  
Ocean Engineering

Additional comments from the Reviewers:

#### Reviewer's Responses to Questions

Note: In order to effectively convey your recommendations for improvement to the author(s), and help editors make well-informed and efficient decisions, we ask you to answer the following specific questions about the manuscript and provide additional suggestions where appropriate.<br><br>1. Are the objectives and the rationale of the study clearly stated?<br><br>Please provide suggestions to the author(s) on how to improve the clarity of the objectives and rationale of the study. Please number each suggestion so that author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: please see "overall comments" in my attached document.

Reviewer #2: No. See my report.

Reviewer #3: Yes  No  N/A

Main comment:

-----

2. If applicable, is the application/theory/method/study reported in sufficient detail to allow for its replicability and/or reproducibility?<br><br>Please provide suggestions to the author(s) on how to improve the replicability/reproducibility of their study. Please number each suggestion so that the author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: Mark as appropriate with an X:

Yes  No  N/A

Provide further comments here: please see my attached document for more details

Reviewer #2: Mark as appropriate with an X:

Yes  No  N/A

Provide further comments here:

Reviewer #3: Yes  No  N/A

Main comment:

-----

3. If applicable, are statistical analyses, controls, sampling mechanism, and statistical reporting (e.g., P-values, CIs, effect sizes) appropriate and well described?<br><br>Please clearly indicate if the manuscript requires

additional peer review by a statistician. Kindly provide suggestions to the author(s) on how to improve the statistical analyses, controls, sampling mechanism, or statistical reporting. Please number each suggestion so that the author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: Mark as appropriate with an X:

Yes  No  N/A

Provide further comments here: please see my attached document for more details

Reviewer #2: Mark as appropriate with an X:

Yes  No  N/A

Provide further comments here:

Reviewer #3: Yes  No  N/A

Main comment:

-----

4. Could the manuscript benefit from additional tables or figures, or from improving or removing (some of the) existing ones?  
Please provide specific suggestions for improvements, removals, or additions of figures or tables. Please number each suggestion so that author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: A table could be useful providing details on the error surrounding the calculated Cf values in either the main manuscript or as supplemental. I did not see any supplemental provided, is that because there isn't any? Please see my page 2 of my attached document for further details.

Reviewer #2: Yes. Please see the uploaded comments.

Reviewer #3: Yes  No  N/A

Main comment:

-----

5. If applicable, are the interpretation of results and study conclusions supported by the data?  
Please provide suggestions (if needed) to the author(s) on how to improve, tone down, or expand the study interpretations/conclusions. Please number each suggestion so that the author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: Mark as appropriate with an X:

Yes  No  N/A

Provide further comments here: please see my attached document

Reviewer #2: Mark as appropriate with an X:

Yes  No  N/A

Provide further comments here:

Reviewer #3: Yes  No  N/A

Main comment:

-----

6. Have the authors clearly emphasized the strengths of their study/theory/methods/argument?  
Please provide suggestions to the author(s) on how to better emphasize the strengths of their study. Please number each suggestion so that the author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: The theory and methods used for the study are well described. The literature review provides sufficient background so that the readers understand where the work fits within the wider literature. Validation of the proposed method data provided in the literature is given as a comparison to the authors results which is good, however I would like to see more details regarding Chan et al., 2015 and Forooghi et al., 2017 which had the most comparable results to those generated in the current paper. Please see page 2 of my attached document for more details on this comment.

Reviewer #2: No. Please see the uploaded comments.

Reviewer #3: Yes  No  N/A

Main comment:

This work intends to provide a practical and simple way to address skin friction drag of a vessel for engineering purpose. For this reason, it is very important to provide a clear description of assumptions and limitations to avoid any wrong use.

More explanation of the motivation and philosophy should be added. Indeed, on a scientific point of view, the added value is not significant since authors propose an empirical formulae based on data set coming from semi-analytical formulation. There is no clear analysis for motivating the choice of the second proposed power function form but just a pure observation of best fit, see commented pdf.

-----

7. Have the authors clearly stated the limitations of their study/theory/methods/argument?<br><br>Please list the limitations that the author(s) need to add or emphasize. Please number each limitation so that author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: There is little written about the limitations of the study and method in the manuscript. Kindly provide the limitations of the formula in the manuscript. Please see the 2nd page of my attached document for further suggestions.

Reviewer #2: No. Please see the uploaded comments.

Reviewer #3: Yes  No  N/A

Main comment:

This work intends to provide a practical and simple way to address skin friction drag of a vessel for engineering purpose. For this reason, it is very important to provide a clear description of assumptions and limitations to avoid any wrong use.

For that reason, the state of the art and discussion suffer of a lack of analysis between the different results observed and the possible limitations related to the assumptions of the different approaches in particular the 3D aspect of a turbulent flow, the impact of fouling height and the assumption of fouling assumed as a small rigid body. Indeed for seaweed, the fluid/structure interaction may represent a strong limitation of this approach in other application such as moored platform where fouling volume are significant even though that in your application, the volume makes probably this assumption acceptable.

-----

8. Does the manuscript structure, flow or writing need improving (e.g., the addition of subheadings, shortening of text, reorganization of sections, or moving details from one section to another)?<br><br>Please provide suggestions to the author(s) on how to improve the manuscript structure and flow. Please number each suggestion so that author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: The manuscript is well structured, starting with a strong literature review, moving through the method to results and discussion. With regards to writing, there are some spelling errors or 'messy' sentences that need rewording which I have highlighted in my attached document.

Reviewer #2: Yes. Please see the uploaded comments.

Reviewer #3: Yes  No  N/A

-----

9. Could the manuscript benefit from language editing?

Reviewer #1: Yes, please ask a native English speaker or a professional language services to proof read and improve the use of English language in your paper.

Reviewer #2: Yes

Reviewer #3: Yes

Reviewer #1: This field is optional. If you have any additional suggestions beyond those relevant to the questions above, please number and list them here.

Please see the uploaded comments.

Reviewer #2: Please see the uploaded comments.

Reviewer #3:

Thank you to propose this practical tool for naval engineering sector. Since the intended use is the engineering one, it is very important to mention the different limitations of the approach to avoid any wrong by future readers.

Please also see the uploaded comments.

\*\*\*\*\*

Reviewers' comments:

(Please note that some reviewers may upload attachments into the system. Please see the following for instructions on how to access these comments: [http://help.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/p/7923/a\\_id/531/c/6261/kw/reviewer%20attachments](http://help.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/p/7923/a_id/531/c/6261/kw/reviewer%20attachments))

\*\*\*\*\*

For further assistance, please visit our customer support site at <http://help.elsevier.com/app/answers/list/p/7923>. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions and learn more about EM via interactive tutorials. You will also find our 24/7 support contact details should you need any further assistance from one of our customer support representatives.

#AU\_OE#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code

---

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/oe/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.



Review (1) for Manuscript Number OE-D-22-02830.pdf

195.4kB



OE-D-22-02830 review.pdf

49.1kB



OE-D-22-02830-Reviewer3V1.pdf

808.1kB

---

**Fwd: OE-D-22-02830R2: Final Decision**

1 message

---

**I Ketut Suastika** <k\_suastika@na.its.ac.id>  
To: Muhammad Luqman Hakim <mluqmanhak@gmail.com>

Thu, May 25, 2023 at 3:38 PM

---

[Dapatkan Outlook untuk Android](#)

---

**From:** [em.oe.0.80bbd4.af98d947@editorialmanager.com](mailto:em.oe.0.80bbd4.af98d947@editorialmanager.com) <[em.oe.0.80bbd4.af98d947@editorialmanager.com](mailto:em.oe.0.80bbd4.af98d947@editorialmanager.com)> on behalf of Ocean Engineering <[em@editorialmanager.com](mailto:em@editorialmanager.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2023 5:01:45 PM  
**To:** I Ketut Suastika <[k\\_suastika@na.its.ac.id](mailto:k_suastika@na.its.ac.id)>  
**Subject:** OE-D-22-02830R2: Final Decision

---

Manuscript No.: OE-D-22-02830R2  
Title: A practical empirical formula for the calculation of ship added friction-resistance due to (bio)fouling  
Article Type: Full length article  
Corresponding Author: Dr. Ketut Suastika  
All Authors: Muhammad Luqman Hakim; Ketut Suastika; I Ketut Aria Pria Utama  
Submit Date: Aug 11, 2022

Dear Dr. Suastika,

Thank you very much for revising your paper. I am pleased to inform you that your paper "A practical empirical formula for the calculation of ship added friction-resistance due to (bio)fouling" has been accepted for publication in Ocean Engineering.

Your accepted manuscript will now be transferred to our production department and work will begin on creation of the proof. If we need any additional information to create the proof, we will let you know. If not, you will be contacted again in the next few days with a request to approve the proof and to complete a number of online forms that are required for publication.

Below are comments from the reviewers.

Thank you for submitting your work to Ocean Engineering.

We encourage authors of original research papers to share the research objects – including raw data, methods, protocols, software, hardware and other outputs – associated with their paper. More information on how our open access Research Elements journals can help you do this is available at [https://www.elsevier.com/authors/tools-and-resources/research-elements-journals?dgcid=ec\\_em\\_research\\_elements\\_email](https://www.elsevier.com/authors/tools-and-resources/research-elements-journals?dgcid=ec_em_research_elements_email).

Yours sincerely,

Dr Tahsin Tezdogan  
Editor-in-Chief  
Ocean Engineering

Comments from the reviewers:

## Reviewer's Responses to Questions

Note: In order to effectively convey your recommendations for improvement to the author(s), and help editors make well-informed and efficient decisions, we ask you to answer the following specific questions about the manuscript and provide additional suggestions where appropriate.

1. Are the objectives and the rationale of the study clearly stated?

Please provide suggestions to the author(s) on how to improve the clarity of the objectives and rationale of the study. Please number each suggestion so that author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: Yes

---

2. If applicable, is the application/theory/method/study reported in sufficient detail to allow for its replicability and/or reproducibility?

Please provide suggestions to the author(s) on how to improve the replicability/reproducibility of their study. Please number each suggestion so that the author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: Mark as appropriate with an X:

Yes  No  N/A

Provide further comments here:

---

3. If applicable, are statistical analyses, controls, sampling mechanism, and statistical reporting (e.g., P-values, CIs, effect sizes) appropriate and well described?

Please clearly indicate if the manuscript requires additional peer review by a statistician. Kindly provide suggestions to the author(s) on how to improve the statistical analyses, controls, sampling mechanism, or statistical reporting. Please number each suggestion so that the author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: Mark as appropriate with an X:

Yes  No  N/A

Provide further comments here:

---

4. Could the manuscript benefit from additional tables or figures, or from improving or removing (some of the) existing ones?

Please provide specific suggestions for improvements, removals, or additions of figures or tables. Please number each suggestion so that author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: No, the authors have responded to comments

---

5. If applicable, are the interpretation of results and study conclusions supported by the data?

Please provide suggestions (if needed) to the author(s) on how to improve, tone down, or expand the study interpretations/conclusions. Please number each suggestion so that the author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: Mark as appropriate with an X:

Yes  No  N/A

Provide further comments here:

---

6. Have the authors clearly emphasized the strengths of their study/theory/methods/argument?

Please provide suggestions to the author(s) on how to better emphasize the strengths of their study. Please number each suggestion so that the author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: Yes, and they have now incorporated how the study is limited

---

7. Have the authors clearly stated the limitations of their study/theory/methods/argument?

Please list the limitations that the author(s) need to add or emphasize. Please number each limitation so that author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: Yes.

---

8. Does the manuscript structure, flow or writing need improving (e.g., the addition of subheadings, shortening of text, reorganization of sections, or moving details from one section to another)?

Please provide suggestions to the author(s) on how to improve the manuscript structure and flow. Please number each suggestion so that author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: Yes

---

9. Could the manuscript benefit from language editing?

Reviewer #1: No

\*\*\*\*\*

For further assistance, please visit our customer support site at <http://help.elsevier.com/app/answers/list/p/7923>. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions and learn more about EM via interactive tutorials. You will also find our 24/7 support contact details should you need any further assistance from one of our customer support representatives.

#AU\_OE#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code



---

*In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. ([Remove my information/details](#)). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.*