> Dear Colleagues,
>
> after reading the report just writen by Dr. Giuseppe Levi at Physics
> Department of Bologna University, that made, as "third part", the
> experiment (performed in an Industrial Laboratory near the city of
> Bologna-Italy on January 14, 2011), I would like to note the following
> in order to improve, deeply, the understanding of what really happened
> and obtain a more accurate measurement of energy balance.
>
> * The key point of the measurement is the assumption that ALL the water
> heated by the reactor went outside the cooling coil as *VAPOR*, NOT
> WATER.
> It arises because:
>
> a) the specific heat capacity at constant pressure (Cp) of water is (in
> mean) about 4.2 J/(g*K);
> b) the enthalpy of vaporitation of water is, at 100°C, as large as 2260 J/g.
>
> The term a) gives a total energy of 4.2* (101-13)= 369.6 J in the
> experimental conditions reported.
>
> In other words, for each g of water, the amout of energy "absorbed" for
> the vapor generation is about 86% of the total (2260/(2260+369.6).
> Moreover, because the dryness of vapor (and the energy-mass balance) is
> a very strong function of "water contamination", as first commented by
> Kenneth Grabowski (at Naval Research Laboratories, Washington DC-USA)
> and detailed by (among others) Horace Heffner (email:
> hheffner@mtaonline.net) at the CMNS discussion list, I think that the
> information given by Levi in his report aren't enough to be completly
> sure about the very large excess energy claimed (of the order of a
> factor 20).
> Moreover, the "detector" of vapor, model HP474AC, can't GUARANTEE, at
> 100% level, the "dryness" of the vapor.
>
> * Because such main considerations, and taking into consideration the
> importance of work performed, and their potentialities for a practical
> application, *I RECCOMEND* to Eng. Andrea Rossi to perform the next
> experiments avoiding all the problems (and doubts) related to vapor
> generation.
>
> I think it can be easly performed just increasing the flux of
> cooling water by a factor of about 10 so that the maximum
> temperature will be of the order of 80-90°C.
>
> I don't know if it will be possible before the incoming ICCF16
> Conference, due to short time allowable.
>
> Anyway, if other details, not written in the report, will be allowable
> it will be possible to go deeper in the SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION of the
> experiment.
>
> * Obviously, once that the scientific aspects will be clarified, Eng.
> Rossi can go over in the vapor generation for practical application
> using his Energy Cathalizer, at temperatures as high as possible!
>
> Thanks for Your attention,
>
> Francesco CELANI

Date: Tue, 25 Jan 2011 20:22:29 +0100
From: "Andrea Rossi - Leonardo Corp." <info@leonardocorp1996.com>

To: "Francesco Celani" <francesco.celani@lnf.infn.it>
Cc: <cmns@googlegroups.com>,
"Steve Krivit" <
"Sergio Focardi" <sergio.focardi@bo.infn.it>
Subject: Re: Short comments on report, by G. Levi, on Rossi-Focardiexperiment held Jan. 14, 2011 at Bologna-Italy.

DEAR SIRS,
WE ALWAYS WORKED WITH WATER, NOT STEAM, IN THE FORMER TESTS WE MADE ALL THE WORLD AROUND. WE ALSO USED AIR. ALL THE DATA COINCIDE. I BELIEVE IN THE WORK OF DR GALANTINI, WHO SAID THAT THE STEAM WAS DRY, BECAUSE I AM PRETTY CONVINCED THAT HE IS ABLE TO ESTABILISH IF A FLOW OF STEAM IS DRY OR NOT. IN ANY CASE:
THE AMOUNT OF ENERGY AT THE OUTPUT SHOULD BE OBTAINED ALSO IF AT 102 CELSIUS DEGREES WE HAD JUST WATER (WHICH IS IMPOSSIBLE), NOT STEAM. I MEAN: IN THE WORST IMAGINABLE SCENARIO WE GOT OUR STRONG SURPLUS RESPECT ELECTROCHEMICAL PRODUCTION. THIS IS JUST A CALCULATION BY ABSURD, BECAUSE THE STEAM WAS DRY, AS CALCULATED BY GALANTINI. AND: WE WILL SEE IT BETTER IN THE PLANTS THAT ARE GOING TO BE PUT IN INDUSTRIAL OPERATION.