

From: Steve Krivit  
Subj: sbsl vs mbsl  
Date: Sat May 19, 2007 11:10 am  
To: "rusi-ecn.purdue.edu" <rusi@ecn.purdue.edu>

Rusi,

I've seen a lot of comments from Suslick, particularly relating to a 2002 paper of his in Nature, where he says that the cap on SBSL stops way before you can expect to get fusion temperatures.

Often the news quotes that I am reading, either directly from Suslick or indirectly, imply that his paper casts doubts on your work. But I understand that your work is MBSL, a different animal. How clear is it to you that characteristics of SBSL can or cannot be compared with MBSL?

Thanks,

Steve

\*\*\*\*\*

To: Steve Krivit [REDACTED]  
cc: [co-author list]  
Subject: Re: sbsl vs mbsl(rpt-krivit, 5.19.07)  
From: <rusi@ecn.purdue.edu>  
Date: Sat, 19 May 2007 14:46:00 -0400

Steve:

This subject has been conclusively settled via several debates over many years and culminating with the 2005 publication of the theoretical foundation for multi bubble vs single bubble fusion and published after 2y of intense reviews /acceptance in Physics of Fluids. I played a minor supportive role in this theoretical effort which was led by Robert Nigmatulin (President, Russian Academy of Sciences, Ufa,Russia) in close collaboration with simultaneous efforts by Dick Lahey (past Dean of Engr at RPI ).

All aspects of criticisms related to endothermic effects by Suslick (2002), Moss, etc were included and accounted for. The theoretical foundation well-predicts overall fusion output for our group's experimental approach but importantly also sheds light on fundamental limitations of the SBSL approach. We now understand why the Suslick/Putterman SBSL approach encompasses physical limitations and will not provide measurable fusion signals.

Fortunately, Robert Nigmatulin is visiting the US this week and will be leaving tomorrow to Russia. Feel free to also confirm with Dick Lahey.

Both Robert and Dick are much better qualified than me for answering and defending theory-related questions.