

**Comparison of
 Aug. 27, 2007 Purdue University Final Report of C-22 Inquiry Committee to
 April 18, 2008 Purdue University Final Report of C-22 Investigation Committee**

The Investigation Committee (Inv.C) used different identifiers for the forwarded allegations from the Inquiry Committee (Inq.C). The labeling of individual allegations from the Investigation Committee versus the corresponding allegations from the Inquiry Committee is provided below:

Table 1. Allegations List from 4.18.08 Inv. Report versus 2007 Inq.C Allegations Formally Transmitted with ONR Approval to 2008 Inv.C	
Forwarded Allegations of 2007 Inq.C Report & –ONR’s Charge for Investigation Cmte.	Corresponding Allegation Labels of 2008 ONR/C-22 Inv.C Report
<p>C2. Taleyarkhan intentionally left his name off the publication in order to create a misleading impression of independent confirmation of sonofusion.</p> <p>(Note: this is related to NED publication)</p> <p>D2. Taleyarkhan intentionally left his name off the publication in order to create a misleading impression of independent confirmation of sonofusion.</p> <p>(Note: this is related to NURETH-11)</p>	<p>A. Allegations relating to NED and NURETH-11 publications (April 18, 2008 Inv.C Report cites source from Aug.27, 2007 Report to ONR as Allegations C2, D2 for this category)</p> <p>A.1 “Dr. Taleyakhan with falsifying intent caused his name not to be included in the author bylines of the NED and NURETH-11 papers to disguise the extent of his involvement in the execution of the work reported and in the writing and submission of the papers.”</p> <p>Conclusion → No research misconduct.</p> <p>A.2 “Dr. Taleyarkhan with falsifying intent caused Adam Butt’s name to be added...”</p> <p><i>Note: This is a newly fabricated Allegation in violation of the approved express charge of this 2008 Inv.C (see left column where such allegation is simply not present) and ironically, it was</i></p>

	<i>already dismissed in 2006 and in 2007.</i>
<p>C3. Taleyarkhan managed the generation of the research reported in the NED paper.</p> <p>C5. Taleyarkhan manipulated the press characterization of the Xu research to create a misleading appearance of independent supervision of Tsoukalas (re: NED)</p> <p>D3. Taleyarkhan manipulated the press characterization of the Xu research to create a misleading appearance of independent supervision of Tsoukalas (re: NURETH-11)</p> <p>L1. For September 2005 presentation at Wayne State University Taleyarkhan falsely cited the Xu publications as an independent confirmation of sonofusion.</p>	<p>B. Allegations relating to claims of independent confirmation(April 18, 2008 Inv.C Report cites source from Aug.27, 2007 Report to ONR as Allegations C3, C5, D3, L1 for this category)</p> <p>B.1 “Dr. Taleyarkhan with falsifying intent caused the July 12, 2005, press release from Purdue University to give credit for sponsorship and direction .. to Dr. Tsoukalas ..”</p> <p>Conclusion → No research misconduct.</p> <p>B.2 “Dr. Taleyarkhan with falsifying intent stated in the opening paragraph of his paper in PRL 96:034301 (2006) that “these observations [referring to Science 295: 1868 (2002)] have now been independently confirmed.”</p> <p><i>Note: This newly introduced Allegation is NOT among the 12 ONR approved charges of the 2007 to the Investigation Committee.</i></p>
<p>C6. The NED and NURETH-11 papers rely upon falsified and/or plagiarized calibration data.</p>	<p>C. Dr. Taleyarkhan with falsifying intent used identical calibration data in the NED and NURETH-11 papers and in his publication in MST 17:191-244 (2005), implying that the data refer to the same experiment. (April 18, 2008 Inv.C Report cites source from Aug.27, 2007 Report to ONR as Allegation C6 for this category)</p> <p>Conclusion → No research misconduct.</p>

<p>E1. MST data is the same as NED/NURETH-11 data</p> <p>E3. Figure 8b of the MST paper plagiarizes Xu's NED Figure 8 and NURETH-11 Fig.6</p>	<p>D. In his publication in MST 17:191-244 (2005), Dr. Taleyarkhan with falsifying intent attempted to make it appear that the same results were the outcomes of several experiments by re-publishing previously published data without citing the original publications. (April 18, 2008 Inv.C Report cites source from Aug.27, 2007 Report to ONR as Allegations E1 and E3 for this category)</p> <p>Conclusion → No research misconduct.</p>
<p>F2. Taleyarkhan was federally funded for the work reported in Physical Review Letters (PRL 96) and has since allegedly claimed he was not.</p>	<p>E. "Dr. Taleyarkhan used federal funds for the work published in PRL 96: 034301 (2006) and failed to acknowledge support. (April 18, 2008 Inv.C Report cites source from Aug.27, 2007 Report to ONR as Allegation F2 for this category)</p> <p>Conclusion → No research misconduct.</p>
<p>G2. In his published response to a forensic analysis by Dr. Brian Naranjo, Taleyarkhan claims to show the same fusion data but, allegedly actually deleted some of his originally published results data on fusion signal.</p>	<p>F. "In his published response ... deleted some of his originally published research results data on fusion signal." (April 18, 2008 Inv.C Report cites source from Aug.27, 2007 Report to ONR as Allegation G2 for this category)</p> <p>Conclusion → No research misconduct.</p>
<p>K1. Taleyarkhan fabricated a fusion demonstration in RHPH G60.</p>	<p>G. "Dr. Taleyarkhan falsified a Sept.19, 2003 fusion demonstration carried out at Purdue by him and Dr. Cho of ORNL." (April 18, 2008 Inv.C Report cites source from Aug.27, 2007 Report to ONR as Allegation K1 for this category)</p> <p>Conclusion → No research misconduct.</p>