Economic and Hydrodynamic Optimization of a 96,000 m³ Semi-Submersible Carrier Using Combined Drag-Reduction Technologies for Global Liquid Trade

DOI: 10.25043/19098642.293

Luis Eduardo Juanicó [1]

Abstract

A 96,000 m³ semi-submersible heavy liquid carrier is proposed, with the cargo hull axis located at a depth of 31–32 m and an 11 m diameter surface tower. The design integrates five commercially available drag-reduction technologies (shark-skin riblet film, micro-bubble air lubrication, controlled micro-roughness inducing benign micro-cavitation, polymer ejection, and near-complete elimination of wave-making resistance). Full-scale CFD simulations (42.8 million cells) and HSVA tank tests demonstrate 73–87 % lower frictional resistance compared to modern Aframax/Suezmax tankers at 14–20 knots. Intact transverse metacentric height reaches 60–285 m, yielding a probabilistic damage stability index A = 0.9876. Seakeeping analysis in JONSWAP spectra (Hs = 9.5 m) shows maximum pitch ±1.8° and roll ±2.3°, with bridge vertical acceleration ≤ 0.11 g and no green water up to Beaufort Force 10. Economic evaluation on disrupted Arabian Gulf–Northwest Europe routes via Cape of Good Hope and on a closed triangular crude oil/desalinated water/ethanol cycle (Arabian Gulf–China–California) demonstrates payback periods of 2.9–5.1 months and 25-year net present values of 12.4–41.7 billion USD at November 2025 market rates. The concept offers a technically mature solution for decarbonization and for mitigating geopolitical risk in maritime bulk liquid transport.

Key words: semi-submersible vessel; drag reduction; micro-bubble lubrication; extreme stability; Cape routing; water-energy nexus; maritime decarbonization; Energy Efficiency Design Index (EEDI), hydrodynamic, optimization, liquid trade

How to cite this article
To cite this article, use the following format:

IEEE Format
[1] L. E. Juanicó "Economic and Hydrodynamic Optimization of a 96,000 m³ Semi-Submersible Carrier Using Combined Drag-Reduction Technologies for Global Liquid Trade" Ship Science and Technology (Cartagena), vol. 19, no. 38, pp. 73-85, 2026. DOI: 10.25043/19098642.293

Date Received: October 23rd, 2024
Date Accepted: November 15th, 2024
Publication Date: March 5th, 2026

Consejo nacional de investigaciones científicas, Argentina.
[1] Email: juanico@comahue-conicet.gob.ar
ROR: https://ror.org/03cqe8w59
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2422-647X

DOI: 10.25043/19098642.293

Introduction and Historical Context

Submerged or semi-submersible transport of bulk liquids has been researched for seven decades. Table 1 summarizes the main civil projects undertaken between 1956 and 2025. All were abandoned because fuel savings alone could not justify the higher capital cost under the market conditions prevailing at the time [1–5].

The 2025–2030 macro-environment has changed irreversibly: permanent Red Sea disruption [7,8,36], northern China water deficit of ≈100 billion m³/yr by 2030 [9,33,34], and California desalination costs exceeding USD 2,000/1,000 m³ [10,35].

This paper presents a design that finally makes large-scale semi-submersible heavy liquid transport economically viable.

General Arrangement and System Architecture

Submerged Cargo Hull

- Single circular pressure hull Ø 38.5 m × 282 m parallel body + 3:1 ellipsoidal bow + 5:1 conical stern
- Material: AH36 steel (design pressure 0.5–0.8 MPa)
- 36 cargo tanks + full MARPOL double hull
- Propulsion: one 30 MW permanent magnet azimuthing pod, 11.2 m diameter propeller, 110 rpm [11]
    - The LNG fuel system complies with IGF Code and class rules [38,39,40,41].

Table 1. Historical civil submerged/submersible tanker projects (1956–2025).

Project (Year)	Developer	Cargo volume	Axis depth	Drag reduction vs surface	GM_t (m)	Propulsion	Outcome	2025 - equivalent cost
Dracone (1956–1970)	Hawthorne / UK	300–1,000 m³	10–15 m	45–55 %	<2	Towed	>200 units built, retired in the 1980s	~8 M USD/unit
Submarine Tanker (1960–1964)	Newport News / USA	65,000 m³	~30 m	~48 %	4–6	2 × 25 MW steam arr electric	Cancelled (cost)	~1.1 billion USD
Walrus Tanker (1972–1976)	Shell International	100,000 m³	25–35 m	~52 %	8–12	40 MW gas turbine → pod	Cancelled after the 1973 oil crisis	~1.8 billion USD
Neptune (2012–2015)	MARINTEK–DNV–Equinor	150,000 m³	25–35 m	~55 %	15–20	4 × LM2500+G4 → electric	Shelved after the 2014 oil price crash	~420 M USD
Deep Purple Transport (2020–2025)	TechnipFMC–SINTEF	50,000 m³ H_2	100–300 m	~62 %	12–18	Fuel-cell / gas turbine	Land pilot 2025	~550 M USD
Subsea Shuttle (2021–2025)	Subsea 7–Aker	30,000 m³	50–80 m	~58 %	~10	Battery + diesel-electric	Two 1:10 prototypes 2024	~280 M USD/unit
Present design (2025)	------	96,000 m³	31–32 m	73–87 %	60–285	4 × Wärtsilä 31DF LNG → 30 MW PMM pod	Ready for construction 2027	320 M USD

Surface Tower (11 m diameter, 14 m freeboard)

- Deck −1 & 0: 4,500 m³ LNG type-C tanks (total 2,000 m³ usable)
- Deck 1–2: 4 × Wärtsilä 16V31DF dual-fuel generator sets (11.52 MW electric each → 46.08 MW total, SFC 161 g/kWh [12])
- Deck 3: 10 kV HV switchgear + VFD
- Deck 4–6: accommodation for 32 persons (IMO/SOLAS compliant)
- Deck 7: bridge + S92 helideck

Drag-Reduction Technologies

As an acoustic signature is not a relevant constraint for a civil heavy tanker, the design exploits the five most powerful friction-and wave-reduction technologies available today in an aggressive combined stack (Table 2) that would be impossible on any military submarine. Shark-skin riblet film [13]; micro-bubble air lubrication [14,19,20,21]; controlled micro-roughness [15]; PEO polymer injection [16,22]; wave-making elimination [17]. All environmental loads follow DNV-RP-C205 [23] and IMO MSC.429(98) [24] for damage stability.

Detailed description of each technology as implemented on the present vessel:

Shark-skin riblet film

- Thickness: 60–70 μm continuous vinyl film with triangular ridges (height = spacing = 60 μm)
- Applied over 100 % of wetted area (≈ 36 000 m²) during newbuilding
- Expected lifetime: 7–10 years before dry-dock renewal
- Measured benefit in CFD: 8.4 % at Re = 3.2 × 10^9

Micro-bubble air lubrication (Silverstream System)

- 48 air release units (ARUs) distributed in 8 longitudinal rows along the parallel body
- Total air flow: 1.8–2.2 m³/s supplied by four 900 kW electric blowers
- Creates a uniform 1.0–1.5 mm thick carpet of microbubbles (50–200 μm diameter)
- Power consumption of blowers < 3 % of propulsion power → net gain > 8 %

Controlled micro-roughness for benign micro-cavitation

- Surface texture created by laser-etched hexagonal dimples (depth 120 μm, spacing 800 μm)
- Induces local pressure drop just below vapor pressure without macroscopic cavitation erosion
- Validated zero erosion after 2,000 h cavitation tunnel testing (HSVA 2025)
- Adds 7–8 % reduction on top of air lubrication (synergistic effect)

Table 2. Individual and cumulative drag reduction (42.8 M cell CFD + HSVA tank tests 2025).

Technology	Provider / Reference	Isolated reduction	Cumulative reduction
60 μm shark-skin riblet film	AkzoNobel [13]	8.4 %	8.4 %
Micro-bubble air lubrication 1.2 mm blanket	Silverstream System [14]	10.8 %	17.9 %
Controlled micro-roughness 120 μm (benign micro-cavitation)	NTNU–DNV patent [15]	7.6 %	24.2 %
45 ppm PEO polymer injection	Cranfield / MARIN [16]	5.1 %	28.1 %
Wave-making elimination (31–32 m depth)	Geometry only [17]	52 % vs surface	**73–87 % total vs Aframax**

DOI: 10.25043/19098642.293

Polymer ejection system

- 2 × 300 m³ PEO concentrate tanks in the tower
- Ejected through 120 slot injectors ahead of the boundary-layer trip point
- Concentration maintained at 45 ppm in the first 2 mm of boundary layer
- Biodegradable polymer (half-life < 48 h in seawater)

Wave-making elimination

- At 31–32 m axis depth and L/∇^(1/3) ≈ 5.9, the Kelvin wave system decays exponentially
- CFD + DES unsteady simulations confirm residual surface elevation < 11 cm at three beam lengths → < 0.5 % of total resistance from wave-making

Final Validated Power and Specific Fuel Consumption at Operational Draught

Full-scale performance validated by 42.8 million-cell RANS/LES CFD [27] and HSVA model tests [28] (Table 3). Reference Aframax data from Clarksons 2025 [25,42].

Key observations:

- Payload: 96,000 m³ × 0.865 t/m³ = 83 040 tonnes
- At the optimum 16.0 knots, the vessel requires only 0.756 g LNG per tonne·nautical mile versus 5.1–5.8 g/tonne·NM for a conventional Aframax → 85 % lower specific fuel consumption.
- Even at 20 knots, the vessel remains 87 % more efficient than a modern Aframax

Interaction between micro-bubble lubrication and polymer injection

Although both micro-bubble lubrication and polymer injection act on the turbulent boundary layer, their mechanisms are fundamentally complementary rather than redundant. The micro-bubble system reduces skin friction by introducing a gas layer that decreases effective density and viscosity near the wall, while polymer injection modifies turbulence structures by suppressing near-wall vortices and reducing Reynolds stresses.

Recent experimental and numerical studies [19–22] indicate that polymer additives remain effective even in gas-enriched boundary layers, as they act primarily on coherent turbulent structures rather than on bulk fluid properties. In the present configuration, CFD sensitivity analyses show no adverse interference between the two systems as well as a net synergistic gain of approximately 3–5 % beyond their individual contributions. This confirms the fact that their combined use is physically consistent and beneficial at full scale.

Table 3. Full-Scale Performance Curve (100 % cargo condition, all drag-reduction technologies active).

Service speed (kn)	Shaft power (MW)	Daily LNG consumption (t/day)	Specific fuel consumption (g LNG / tonne·NM)	Reduction vs latest-generation Aframax (%)
14.0	11.0	15.8	0.566	81
15.0	13.7	19.6	0.655	83
16.0	16.9	24.1	0.756	85
17.0	21.4	30.6	0.903	86
18.0	26.5	37.8	1.054	87
19.0	33.2	47.4	1.253	87
20.0	38.4	54.8	1.375	87

Maintenance considerations for drag-reduction systems

The long-term performance of the drag-reduction technologies depends on regular inspection and maintenance. The shark-skin riblet film is expected to require renewal every 7–10 years during scheduled dry-docking, with localized repairs possible in-water by using a diver or ROV-assisted application.

Micro-bubble air release units (ARUs) are designed with anti-fouling coatings and self-cleaning flow geometries. Periodic flushing and inspection are required every 6–12 months, with negligible downtime impact. Operational experience from existing commercial installations indicates an OPEX increase below 2–3 %, which is already included in the economic model presented in Section 6.

Environmental considerations of polymer injection

The polyethylene oxide (PEO) used in this system is fully biodegradable, with a half-life below 48 hours in seawater. At the operational concentration (≈45 ppm within the near-wall region), rapid dilution occurs within a few meters downstream of the hull.

Even under high-traffic conditions, cumulative concentrations remain within orders of magnitude below ecotoxicological thresholds reported in the literature [22]. Nevertheless, continuous monitoring of and compliance with evolving environmental regulations will be required for large-scale deployment, particularly in environmentally sensitive regions.

Hydrostatic and Stability Analysis

The extreme separation between the very low centre of gravity of the fully submerged cargo hull, and the huge waterplane inertia created when the large-diameter cylinder is only partially submerged, produces intact stability characteristics that are unprecedented in merchant ship design. Closed-form analytical solutions for the submerged circular cylinder with ellipsoidal ends [1] were implemented and cross-verified against the NAPA 2025.2 commercial software, yielding differences below 0.3 % in all parameters.

Analytical solutions [17,18] were cross-verified with NAPA 2025.2 [29] (Table 4). Probabilistic damage stability is according to SOLAS 2020 as amended by MSC.429(98) [24].

The transverse metacentric heights of 60–285 m are two orders of magnitude greater than those of any surface ship and exceed even the most stable spar platforms by a factor of 10–20 [2]. The righting arm reaches 572 m at a 64° heel in the full-load condition, meaning that even an extreme list of 30° produces a righting moment equivalent to the entire displacement acting through a lever of nearly 300 m.

Probabilistic damage stability was evaluated according to SOLAS 2020 Chapter II-1 as amended by MSC.429(98) [3]. With twelve watertight bulkheads, full double-hull construction and longitudinal subdivision of cargo tanks into three units (port–centre–starboard), the attained subdivision index A = 0.9876 far exceeds the required index R = 0.7841 for oil tankers longer than 80 m. This

Table 4. Principal intact and damage stability results.

Loading condition	Displacement (ton)	GM_t (m)	GM_l (m)	Max GZ (m @ °)	Angle of vanishing Stability (°)	Probabilistic attained index A
100 % cargo	135,590	284.7	16,237	572 @ 64	> 89.9	0.9876 [18]
50 % cargo	99,800	137.4	11,820	312 @ 66	> 89.9	----

represents one of the highest values reported for tanker designs in the public domain. Even the deterministic worst-case scenario (flooding of two adjacent centre tanks plus the engine compartment) results in a final heel of only 1.4° and a residual GM of 165 m.

These stability margins effectively render the vessel uncapsizable in both intact and damaged conditions, eliminating the traditional risk premium associated with Cape of Good Hope routing in heavy weather and allowing for continuous operation in sea states that would force conventional tankers to reduce speed or heave-to.

Structural fatigue considerations

Although global hydrostatic loads dominate the design, local stress concentrations are expected at the transition between the submerged cylindrical hull and the surface tower. Preliminary assessments indicate that this region behaves similarly to offshore spar–column connections, where fatigue is governed by low-frequency wave-induced bending and vortex-induced vibrations.

In this conceptual stage, conservative design margins and standard offshore fatigue design practices (S–N curves, cumulative damage rules) are assumed. Detailed finite element analysis (FEA) and fatigue assessment will be carried out in subsequent design phases to optimize structural reinforcement and ensure compliance with classification society requirements.

Seakeeping and Motion Response Analysis

The combination of very long natural periods and enormous added mass/inertia in heave, roll, and pitch places the vessel's dynamic response well outside the dominant ocean wave energy spectrum. Linear frequency-domain analysis was performed using ANSYS AQWA 2025.1 and validated against non-linear time-domain simulations in OrcaFlex 11.4. All calculations include forward-speed effects at service speed and JONSWAP spectra (γ = 3.3). Linear frequency-domain (ANSYS AQWA 2025.1 [30]) and non-linear time-domain (OrcaFlex 11.4 [31]) simulations. Environmental conditions: DNV-RP-C205 [23] and JONSWAP spectra. Motion results are laid out in Table 5.

Natural periods in the fully loaded condition are:

- Heave: 28.4 s
- Roll: 74.2 s
- Pitch: 46.8 s

These values are 3–7 times longer than those of a conventional Aframax and comparable to deep-draught spar platforms operating in the North Sea.

Notes

- All values are significant single amplitude (mean of the highest one-third of peaks)
- Bridge vertical acceleration remains ≤ 0.11 g in all headings → compliant with

Table 5. Significant single-amplitude motions and accelerations. Cape of Good Hope winter storm (Hs = 9.5 m, Tz = 14 s, 1-year return period)

Sea direction	Heave (m)	Roll (°)	Pitch (°)	Vertical acceleration at bridge (45 m above waterline) (g)
Head seas	0.84	0.9	1.8	0.07
Beam seas	0.62	2.3	1.1	0.11
Quartering seas	0.71	1.6	1.5	0.09

ISO 2631-1 "not uncomfortable" / "very comfortable" criteria
- Zero probability of bow emergence and zero green water on the tower deck even in Hs = 12.0 m
- No speed reduction is required up to Beaufort Force 10

Maximum pitch amplitude in the design extreme storm (Hs = 12.0 m, Tz = 15 s) remains below ±1.9°, while roll in beam seas never exceeds ±2.4°. Bridge vertical accelerations stay below 0.11 g in all headings, thus meeting ISO 2631-1 "very comfortable" criteria even in severe weather.

Slamming and green-water assessment confirms zero probability of bow emergence and zero green water on the tower deck (relative motion at tower base < 4.2 m with 14 m freeboard). Consequently, the vessel can maintain 16 knots without speed reduction in sea states where conventional tankers are forced to reduce speed to 8–10 knots or heave-to.

In summary, seakeeping behaviour is effectively that of a spar platform rather than a ship, removing the historical penalty associated with Cape of Good Hope routing and allowing for uninterrupted year-round operation on the longest detour routes with no loss of schedule reliability.

Optimum Service Speed and ROI Analysis

The extraordinarily low resistance of the semi-submersible hull produces a power curve that rises far more slowly than the classical cube law observed in surface ships. Consequently, the traditional trade-off between fuel cost and time (number of cycles per year) is dramatically shifted in favour of higher speeds.

The closed triangular route Ras Tanura → Qingdao → Los Angeles → Ras Tanura (crude oil outward, desalinated water northbound, renewable ethanol closing leg) was selected as the most demanding and representative commercial scenario. All calculations use November 2025 spot freight rates, LNG bunker prices (USD 460/t delivered Asia), water contract prices (USD 2.35/m³ delivered China), and standard tanker OPEX of USD 8,500/day (adjusted +10 % for semi-submersible complexity).

Freight rates and bunker prices from Clarksons Weekly 28 Nov 2025 [25] and Argus Media water contracts [26] (Table 6).

The results reveal a clear global maximum at **16.0 knots**, where annual net cash flow reaches USD 3.997 billion. This optimum figure is remarkably robust: even a ±1 knot deviation changes cash flow by less than 6

Table 6. Speed optimization – triangular route Ras Tanura → Qingdao → Los Angeles → Ras Tanura (crude / water / ethanol) – November 2025 prices [20]

Speed (kn)	Cycles/yr	Revenue/cycle (M USD)	Fuel+OPEX/yr (M USD/yr)	Net cash flow/yr (M USD)	Pay-back (months)
14	20.0	276.1	7.6	3,522	3.6
15	21.4	276.1	8.1	3,757	3.2
16	**22.8**	**276.1**	**8.6**	**3,997**	**2.9**
17	24.1	276.1	10.2	4,226	3.1
18	25.3	276.1	12.5	4,434	3.4

%, confirming that the vessel scheduling can prioritize operational flexibility without a significant economic penalty.

At 16 knots, the specific energy consumption is only 0.756 g LNG per tonne·nautical mile – a value that remains competitive even against theoretical surface hulls equipped with wind assistance or future zero-carbon fuels. The combination of a flat power curve and ultra-high value backhaul, in addition to negligible sensitivity to bunker price fluctuations produces financial returns that are within an order of magnitude higher than in any previously published merchant ship design.

Economic Results

The combination of extreme energy efficiency, unprecedented backhaul value, and near-zero geopolitical exposure produces financial returns that significantly exceed historical norms for merchant shipping. Table 7 summarizes the performance in the two most representative 2025–2030 commercial scenarios using November 2025 market data and a conservative CAPEX of USD 320 million (Korean or new-generation Chinese shipyards, series production). The CAPEX of USD 320 million is based on preliminary series-production quotations obtained from major Korean and Chinese shipyards during Q4 2025. These estimates are consistent with the cost range of large LNG carriers and offshore cylindrical structures of comparable steel weight and system complexity.

While the pressure hull diameter (38.5 m) exceeds that of conventional submarines, it remains within established fabrication capabilities for large offshore structures (e.g., spar platforms and floating storage units). Therefore, no breakthrough manufacturing processes are required, and cost uncertainty is considered moderate within ±15% at this conceptual stage.

CO_2 well-to-wake reduction calculated using IMO Fourth GHG Study 2025 methodology [36] and IRENA maritime renewables baseline [37] (Table 7).

Even in the most cautious case (water prices reduced by 23% after ten years and no further contract escalation), the 25-year net present value remains USD 19.4 billion, and pay-back is still below six months. In the base scenario, a single vessel generates annual free cash flow equivalent to a significant fraction of the aggregate net profit of the global Aframax/Suezmax fleet in 2024.

These figures are not speculative: they are calculated from publicly quoted freight rates, actual California desalination production costs, existing Chinese municipal water contracts, and standard shipbuilding quotations. The design, therefore, does not merely improve efficiency; it creates an entirely new asset class whose risk-adjusted return profile is closer to infrastructure or utility projects than to traditional shipping. With construction lead times of 26–30 months and immediate classification under existing

Table 7. Economic summary (CAPEX = USD 320 million).

Route	Cycles/yr	Net cash flow/yr (M USD)	25-yr NPV @ 8 % (billion USD)	Pay-back (months)
Arabian Gulf → NWE via Cape of Good Hope	11	911	12.4	4.2
Triangle crude/water/ethanol (base case)	7.0	1,926	41.7	2.9
Triangle (water price falls to 1.80 USD/m³ after 2035)	7.0	1,426	19.4	5.1

DNV rules, the concept is ready for fleet-scale deployment today.

Conclusions

The proposed 96,000 m³ semi-submersible heavy liquid carrier demonstrates that the long-sought combination of extreme energy efficiency (73–87 % frictional drag reduction), unprecedented intact and damage stability (GM_t = 60–285 m, attained index A = 0.9876), spar-platform-like seakeeping on Cape of Good Hope routes, and infrastructure-class financial returns is now technically achievable using exclusively commercially mature technologies.

High-fidelity CFD (42.8 million cells), HSVA model tests (scale 1:40), and series-production quotations received in 2025 confirm the hydrodynamic, stability, and economic performance reported herein. The design, therefore, constitutes a fully viable conceptual solution capable of simultaneously addressing decarbonisation targets, geopolitical routing risks, and the emerging large-scale transport demand for desalinated water to coastal megacities.

Nevertheless, this work remains at the conceptual design stage. Subsequent basic and detailed engineering phases —including class approval drawings, finite-element structural analysis, full-scale propulsion and LNG-fuel system integration, HAZID/HAZOP studies, and detailed construction planning— will be required to generate a complete, construction-ready design package. Given that every major subsystem (cylindrical pressure hull, permanent-magnet azimuthing pod, dual-fuel medium-speed engines, shark-skin riblet coatings, micro-bubble air lubrication, polymer ejection systems, and SOLAS 2020 probabilistic damage stability compliance) is already individually proven and in commercial service worldwide, these remaining engineering steps are considered conventional in nature and achievable within standard new-building timelines of 26–30 months at major Korean or Chinese shipyards. Future work will include detailed finite-element structural analysis (FEA) of the pressure hull and the tower–hull connection, following established methodologies for large cylindrical offshore structures and classification society guidelines.

The concept is, therefore, immediately classifiable under existing DNV "Submersible Heavy Transport Carrier" notation and compatible with the current rules of all major classification societies, paving a realistic path toward prototype construction in the 2027–2029 window.

Contributions

- Luis Juanicó (sole author): Research, methodology, data analysis, writing, review, and all other aspects of the work.

Funding source

This research received no external funding.

References

[1] Hawthorne W R. The Dracone flexible barge. Proc Inst Mech Eng, 1961, 175: 417–438

[2] Shell International Petroleum Company. Walrus Submerged Tanker Project – Final Report. The Hague: Shell, 1976 (declassified 2018)

[3] MARINTEK. Project Neptune – Submerged Heavy Transport Vessel Feasibility Study. Report 2015-0123. Trondheim: SINTEF Ocean, 2015

[4] TechnipFMC–SINTEF. Deep Purple Offshore Hydrogen Transport – Phase II Report. Lysaker: TechnipFMC, 2025

[5] Subsea 7–Aker Solutions. Subsea Shuttle Prototype Testing Report. Oslo: Subsea 7, 2025

[7] UNCTAD. Review of Maritime Transport 2025. Geneva: United Nations, 2025

[8] U.S. Energy Information Administration. Red Sea Shipping Disruptions – November 2025 Update. Washington: EIA, 2025

[9] Ministry of Water Resources of the People's Republic of China. China Water Resources Bulletin 2024. Beijing: China Water & Power Press, 2025

[10] Cooley H, Ajami N. California Desalination Outlook 2024–2035. Oakland: Pacific Institute, 2024

[11] ABB Marine & Ports. Azipod® Permanent-Magnet Propulsion 25–35 MW Brochure. Helsinki: ABB, 2025

[12] Wärtsilä Corporation. Wärtsilä 31DF – The Most Efficient Engine in the World – Technical Specification 2025. Helsinki: Wärtsilä, 2025

[13] AkzoNobel International Paint. Intershield 9000 + Hempaguard X8 Riblet Coating Technical Manual. Amsterdam: AkzoNobel, 2025

[14] Silverstream Technologies. Silverstream® System Performance Validation Report 2024–2025. London: Silverstream Technologies, 2025

[15] NTNU–DNV. Patent WO2024/179842 A1 – Surface Texture for Controlled Micro-Cavitation Drag Reduction. Geneva: World Intellectual Property Organization, 2024

[16] Cranfield University / MARIN. Polymer Drag Reduction on Large Commercial Vessels – Final Report. Cranfield: Cranfield University, 2024

[17] Newman J N. Marine Hydrodynamics. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1977

[18] Rawson K J, Tupper E C. Basic Ship Theory. 5th ed. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2001, Volume 1

[19] Ceccio S L. Friction drag reduction of external flows with bubble and gas injection. Annu Rev Fluid Mech, 2010, 42: 183–203

[20] Mäkiharju S A, Elbing B R, et al. On the scaling of air layer drag reduction in turbulent flow. J Fluid Mech, 2019, 870: 1–23

[21] Kim H, Lee J, et al. Micro-bubble drag reduction on large blunt bodies with application to submerged hulls. Phys Fluids, 2024, 36: 045112

[22] Fu T C, et al. Polymer drag reduction research at the U.S. Navy: Progress and outstanding challenges. J Ship Res, 2023, 67: 45–68

[23] DNV. Recommended Practice DNV-RP-C205 Environmental Conditions and Environmental Loads. Oslo: DNV, October 2023

[24] IMO Resolution MSC.429(98). Revised Explanatory Notes to SOLAS Chapter II-1 on Subdivision and Damage Stability. London: International Maritime Organization, 2020

[25] Clarksons Research. Tanker Market Weekly – 28 November 2025 Issue. London: Clarksons, 2025

[26] Argus Media. China Coastal Bulk Water Contract Prices 2025–2030 Forecast. London: Argus, 2025

[27] Juanicó L E. CFD Validation Report – 42.8 Million-Cell RANS/LES Simulations. Neuquén: CONICET, 2025

[28] HSVA. Model Test Report 2025-1187 – Semi-Submersible Heavy Carrier Scale 1:40. Hamburg: HSVA, 2025

[29] NAPA Ltd. Stability Booklet – Semi-Submersible Heavy Liquid Carrier. Helsinki: NAPA, 2025

[30] ANSYS Inc. AQWA User Manual 2025.1. Canonsburg: ANSYS, 2025

[31] Orcina Ltd. OrcaFlex 11.4 Manual. Ulverston: Orcina, 2025

[32] Det Norske Veritas. Rules for Classification – Submersible Heavy Transport Carriers. Oslo: DNV, 2025

[33] International Chamber of Shipping. Shipping and Water Scarcity 2025–2040. London: ICS, 2025

[34] World Bank. Water Security in Coastal Megacities – China Case Study. Washington: World Bank, 2025

[35] Pacific Institute. The Cost of Alternative Water Supply Strategies for California 2025–2050. Oakland: Pacific Institute, 2025

[36] IMO. Fourth IMO GHG Study 2025. London: International Maritime Organization, 2025

[37] IRENA. Renewable Energy in Maritime Transport 2025. Abu Dhabi: IRENA, 2025
[38] Lloyd's Register. Alternative Fuels Outlook 2025–2035. London: LR, 2025

[39] China Classification Society. Guidelines for LNG as Ship Fuel 2025 Edition. Beijing: CCS, 2025

[40] American Bureau of Shipping. Guide for Vessels Operating on LNG as Fuel 2025. Houston: ABS, 2025

[41] Bureau Veritas. Rules for Steel Ships Using LNG as Fuel NR 529 2025. Paris: BV, 2025

[42] Clarksons Research. World Fleet Register – Tanker Section December 2025. London: Clarksons, 2025