

Ch	Sec	Para	Comment																				
7	2	2.3.1	<p>The required thickness for cross deck shown below is obtained by the buckling analysis of global strength assessment for P'max BC.</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>4CH(Ball)</td><td>3CH(Ore)</td><td>2CH(Emp)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td>5CH-4CH</td><td>4CH-3CH</td><td>3CH-2CH</td><td>2CH-1CH</td></tr><tr><td>Upper Deck</td><td>25.0AH36</td><td>23.0AH36</td><td>21.0AH36</td><td>15.0AH32</td></tr><tr><td>Cross Deck</td><td>16.5AH32</td><td>18.0AH32</td><td>19.5AH32</td><td>22.5AH32</td></tr></table> <p>As a result, it is found that the required thickness for cross deck tends to be thicker than that of upper deck. This phenomenon is more remarkable towards the forward end of the three hold model where the sectional modulus is lesser. In this respect, following reasons are considered.</p> <p>1. The current boundary condition is that the both ends of model are simply supported and Rx at fore end is fixed and Rx at aft end is free which results the model to deform too softly.</p> <p>2. The subjected Load case is Full Load condition and applied design wave is P1, hence torsional moment induces.</p> <p>3. As such, the maximum stress occurs around hatch corners, which may be due to the combination of longitudinal stress due to hull girder bending and twisting under torsional loads, in line with the large local deformation of the elements in the area.</p> <p>To obtain the feasible required thickness for cross deck, it is suggested that that Dx for Independent point on aft end of model to be fixed as forward end of the model.</p>		4CH(Ball)	3CH(Ore)	2CH(Emp)			5CH-4CH	4CH-3CH	3CH-2CH	2CH-1CH	Upper Deck	25.0AH36	23.0AH36	21.0AH36	15.0AH32	Cross Deck	16.5AH32	18.0AH32	19.5AH32	22.5AH32
	4CH(Ball)	3CH(Ore)	2CH(Emp)																				
	5CH-4CH	4CH-3CH	3CH-2CH	2CH-1CH																			
Upper Deck	25.0AH36	23.0AH36	21.0AH36	15.0AH32																			
Cross Deck	16.5AH32	18.0AH32	19.5AH32	22.5AH32																			