

Title of the paper reviewed:

Critical analysis of ECDIS type specific training

The presented article is more a description of the ECDIS and ECDIS type specific training having a small plagiarism rate, of under 20%. One of the first remarks is that the abbreviation used "ECDIS" is not explained in the article. The article is presenting ECDIS together with the risks associated with the use of this system. The paper is paying attention especially to the risk of operation of this system. In the article the assumption is made that these operation risks are related to insufficient training of the ship's deck officers. This assumption is however not backed up by any data. The paper underlines the importance of the ECDIS type specific training, since this system is to be implemented in order to warrant the safe navigation.

In the chapter 4, the article is describing different types of training for using ECDIS and is enumerating the existing methods of ECDIS specific training, stressing out their advantages and disadvantages. In the same chapter, one more unproven statement is made, that is to say the duration of the training is directly proportional with the result of the respective training, meaning that longer training corresponds to better results of the training. The article is failing to support this statement too.

The presentation of the information related to ECDIS is understandable but unfortunately it suffers since the English in the article is rather poor. Some of the mistakes are:

"the use of the system by an operator who is not well familiar with *its work...*"

"The training carried out by an instructor approved by the manufacturer *has introduced* as a result of the need ..."

The article fails to answer the question it sets out to answer in the abstract, namely to "suggest standards" for ECDIS type specific training and is only

recommending the implementation of certain standards, without naming them, not even in general lines.

The assumptions made within the article: on the one hand the assumption made in the chapter 4, that longer duration of training is implying better knowledge of the system and on the other hand, the assumption in the conclusion that training taking place at different training centers or for different ECDIS models is automatically producing different level of knowledge of the system, both are supported neither by data nor by proven facts. The backup data which could support these assumptions made in the article could be for example data regarding maritime incidents or accidents due to insufficient training period or due to training in specific training centers or pertaining to a certain ECDIS model.

Conclusions of the reviewer:

- 1) The abbreviation ECDIS should be explained in the article
- 2) English of the paper should be revised
- 3) Revise the paper either by adding data or facts to support the assumptions made in the paper or remove these unproven assumptions from the paper and leave it as a descriptive article
- 4) Remove or reformulate the objective of the paper to “suggest standards”, since the article fails to answer this question