

## Document Review Comment Log

<b>Title of Document:</b> AC 20-18B, Qualification Testing of Turbojet and Turbofan Engine Thrust Reversers	
<b>Author:</b>	Alan Strom, 781-238-7143
<b>Technical Writer/Editor:</b>	Daniel Tibuni, 781-238-7181
<b>Comments Disposition Date:</b>	April 3, 2015

<b>Commenter:</b> • Complete Reviewing Office information and your Comments.						
<b>Reviewing Office</b>						
<b>Organization:</b>						
<b>Comments Submitted By:</b>		AIRBUS				
<b>Phone:</b>						
#	Name and Mail Stop	Page and Paragraph Number	Comment	Reason for Comment	Recommendation	Disposition/Response to Comment
1		P 2, para 5b	Sentence starting "Section 25.934 does not allow..." is a true statement, but it does not reflect practice on all programs.	The AC should give practical advice.	After sentence starting "Section 25.934 does not allow..." add new sentence "However, on several projects issue papers have been issued allowing testing other than that specified in 33.97."	Partially agree.  Changes made to paragraph 7 describing how to address deviations from the thrust reverser type design during the § 33.97(a) engine testing. Added, "The text of" before "section 25.934 does not allow...."

**Author:**

Disposition the comments in the last column. Identify each disposition as:

- Agree;
  - Partially Agree;
  - Do Not Agree; or
  - Agree, but Outside of Scope (will consider in next change/revision).
- Note:** Provide enough explanation or justification to your comment disposition.

Substantive comments must be resolved and do not include the following unless they change the intent:

- correct grammar or sentence structure;
- correct term use
- simple text changes that clarify the intent, meaning, or to improve readability
- change in format/structure of the overall document

**Note:** Please forward editorial comments to the Tech Writer for resolution.

## Document Review Comment Log

<b>Title of Document:</b> AC 20-18B, Qualification Testing of Turbojet and Turbofan Engine Thrust Reversers	
<b>Author:</b>	Alan Strom, 781-238-7143
<b>Technical Writer/Editor:</b>	Daniel Tibuni, 781-238-7181
<b>Comments Disposition Date:</b>	April 3, 2015

2		P 2, para 7	In para 6 it is correctly stated that the extent to which the TRU needs to be the type design is defined in para 7. This message needs to be reinforced at the beginning of para 7.	To clarify that a type design TRU is not required for engine compatibility testing.	Add the following sentence immediately before 7a:  “... or operability of the engine. The tested thrust reverser must be representative of the type design to the extent described below.”	Agree.  Added text as suggested.
3		P 3, para 7a	The sentence starting “The reason for incorporating the type design thrust reverser ...” is incorrect.	The thrust reverser does not need to be to the type design for the endurance test. It needs to be representative, as addressed by comment 2.	Delete “type design” from the following sentence:  “The reason for incorporating the <del>type design</del> thrust reverser in the endurance test, even if the thrust reverser is not actuated, is to ensure that	Partially agree.  Did not delete the words “type design, “ but added a sentence in the body of the paragraph, “Any deviations between the type design thrust reverser and the thrust reverser used during the test must not affect the mechanical or aerodynamic loads on the engine.”

**Author:**

Disposition the comments in the last column. Identify each disposition as:

- Agree;
- Partially Agree;
- Do Not Agree; or
- Agree, but Outside of Scope (will consider in next change/revision).

**Note:** Provide enough explanation or justification to your comment disposition.

Substantive comments must be resolved and do not include the following unless they change the intent:

- correct grammar or sentence structure;
- correct term use
- simple text changes that clarify the intent, meaning, or to improve readability
- change in format/structure of the overall document

**Note:** Please forward editorial comments to the Tech Writer for resolution.

## Document Review Comment Log

<b>Title of Document:</b> AC 20-18B, Qualification Testing of Turbojet and Turbofan Engine Thrust Reversers	
<b>Author:</b>	Alan Strom, 781-238-7143
<b>Technical Writer/Editor:</b>	Daniel Tibuni, 781-238-7181
<b>Comments Disposition Date:</b>	April 3, 2015

						the mechanical and aerodynamic loads from the stowed thrust reverser are applied to the engine.”
4		P 4, para 10	Same as comment 1.	Same as comment 1.	Same as comment 1.	Partially agree.  Changes made to paragraph 7 describing how to address deviations from the thrust reverser type design during the § 33.97(a) engine testing. Added, “The text of” before “section 25.934 does not allow...”

**Author:**

Disposition the comments in the last column. Identify each disposition as:

- Agree;
- Partially Agree;
- Do Not Agree; or
- Agree, but Outside of Scope (will consider in next change/revision).

**Note:** Provide enough explanation or justification to your comment disposition.

Substantive comments must be resolved and do not include the following unless they change the intent:

- correct grammar or sentence structure;
- correct term use
- simple text changes that clarify the intent, meaning, or to improve readability
- change in format/structure of the overall document

**Note:** Please forward editorial comments to the Tech Writer for resolution.