

connote both "water" and "epoxy." On the other hand, in the cited marks, AQUA could suggest water or a color, while applicant's AQUATA suggests water (aquatic) but not a color designation. However, the key factual determination before us when considering this critical du Pont factor is whether applicant's insertion of its "TA" syllable into the middle of this long, compound term results in perceptible visual and aural differences sufficient to conclude that the marks are basically dissimilar as to overall sound and appearance.

As to appearance, we agree with applicant that AQUATAPOXY, a single word, has a decidedly different appearance from both AQUA POXY and AQUA EPOXY because of the additional "TA" syllable and the absence of any space within the term. Additionally, as to pronunciation, the cited marks are fairly straightforward - four syllables of ak'w? p k-e or five syllables of ak'w? ? -p k-e . However, given that "there is no correct pronunciation of a trademark," In re Belgrade Shoe, 411 F.2d 1352, 162 USPQ 227 (CCPA 1969), and Yamaha International Corp. v. Stevenson, 196 USPQ 701 (TTAB 1977), and cases cited therein, applicant's mark may be pronounced ak'w? ta-p k-e or ? kwat' a-p k-e . In either case, it is a much more challenging term to