

**THERMAL AND NUCLEAR ASPECTS OF THE Pd/D₂O
SYSTEM**

**Vol. 2: SIMULATION OF THE ELECTROCHEMICAL CELL
(ICARUS) CALORIMETRY**

S. Szpak and P. A. Mosier-Boss, eds.

FOREWORD

The calorimetry of any electrochemical cell involves two type of activities: data collection and data evaluation. The required data are the cell potential–time and cell temperature–time series. The evaluation is based on conservation laws subject to constraints dictated by cell design and the adapted experimental procedure.

Volume 2 of this report deals with the modeling and simulation of the Dewar-type calorimeter. It was written by Professor Fleischmann to provide an authoritative discussion of the calorimetry of electrochemical cells. The emphasis is on the interpretation of data and the accuracy of the determination of the excess enthalpy generation via the appropriate selection of heat transfer coefficients. The discussion of the calorimetry of the Dewar-type cells is presented in the form of technical report for a number of reasons, among them: (i) its length would likely prohibit publication in topical journals, (ii) to clarify misunderstandings regarding the principles of calorimetry as applied to electrochemical cell in general and to the cell employed by Fleischmann and his collaborators, in particular.

S. Szpak and P.A. Mosier–Boss, eds.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

SYMBOLS USED 3

1. THE EVOLUTION OF THE ICARUS DATA EVALUATION STRATEGIES 5

2. DEFINITION OF THE HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENTS 7

3. DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS GOVERNING THE BEHAVIOR OF THE CALORIMETERS: SIMULATIONS OF THE TEMPERATURE–TIME SERIES 17

4. SPECIFICATION OF THE ICARUS–1 EXPERIMENTAL PROTOCOLS AND DATA EVALUATION PROCEDURES 23

5. EVALUATION OF THE “RAW DATA” GENERATED USING THE SIMULATION DESCRIBED IN SECTION 4 25

6. EVALUATION OF A MEASUREMENT CYCLE FOR A “BLANK EXPERIMENT” USING AN ICARUS–2 SYSTEM 33

7. ASSESSMENT OF THE SPECIFICATION OF THE ICARUS–1 EXPERIMENTAL PROTOCOLS AND DATA EVALUATION PROCEDURES 43

REFERENCES 47

FIGURES 49

TABLES 117

INTRODUCTION

Apart from some fragmentary investigations, primarily related to the study of the self-discharge of batteries, there exists no well defined set of studies in the field of the electrochemical calorimetry. We note that such studies would allow the investigation of the thermal behavior of a wide range of reactions, especially irreversible processes. Thus, the establishment of an accurate model of an experiment is very important. However, as this aspect is not generally understood, we felt it necessary to produce this document.

In spite of its length, this volume only covers the analysis of a data set generated by calculation and one measurement cycle for a “blank experiment.” We believe that it is very important to produce a detailed analysis and account (as far as is possible at this stage) of the methodology which we adopted. This is especially important in view of the misleading comments which have been made about the calorimetry of the Pd/D system. Taken at face value, one must believe that the workers concerned do not understand the difference between differential and integral coefficients, the disadvantages of differentiating “noisy” data as compared to integrating such data, the differences between the precision and accuracy of data evaluations, the recognition of “negative” and “positive feedback,” the analysis of cooling curves, etc. They do not understand relaxation nor recognize the presence of strange attractors and the way in which the effects of such complications can be circumvented.¹

It is relevant here to reflect on the precision and accuracy of the experiments. Of course, if the precision is high, then there will be no difficulty in interpreting changes in the rates of excess enthalpy generation as small as 1 mW at the 10σ level.² Of course,

¹Of course, it is possible that the researchers concerned do not understand any of these matters, but what is so remarkable is that they have failed to understand these topics even when they have been described to them.

²However, the high precision of the instrumentation (relative errors below 0.01%) has been converted into a 10% error by the group at NHE. It is hard to see how anybody can make such an assertion while still keeping a straight face. If the errors were as high as this, then it would be impossible to say anything sensible about calorimetry – for that matter, it would remove one of the main planks of scientific methodology.

the question of the magnitude of the errors raises three further important questions: (i) what error limits are required so as to be able to detect excess enthalpy generation at an adequate level of statistical significance? (ii) what is the difference (if any) between the experiments carried out with ICARUS systems and ICARUS look-alikes and with other types of calorimetry? (iii) how can one assess the error limits of a given piece of instrumentation?

The answer is that one simply stops the development of the methodology when one is able to make an adequate set of measurements. We note here that this particular specification is itself dependent on the physical size of the systems being investigated as well as the chosen operating conditions. In our particular investigation the limit was certainly reached when the errors had been reduced to the 0.01% level. Naturally, the first question impacts on the second and we note that it is the use of less precise and accurate calorimetric methods which has bedeviled so much of the research in this field. The reason is that with the use of less precise/accurate methods, it becomes impossible to monitor the build-up of excess enthalpy generation. This then brings us to the third question and the answer to this is exactly with the methods outlined in this document, at least as far as isoperibolic calorimetry is concerned (although it is not very difficult to specify improvements in those methods!).³ It is relevant that although errors had undoubtedly been made in setting up these experiments, the detailed data analyses had also shown the way in which such errors could be allowed for.⁴

To reiterate, we considered it necessary to produce this document for the following reasons: Firstly, it is always essential to determine the Instrument Function (or of a parameter or sets of parameters which define the Instrument Function) and to validate the methods of data analysis. Such validation is best done using simulated/calculated data. Secondly, one needs to see the extent to which “blank” experiments conform to expectations. Thirdly, one needs to investigate the ways in which methods of data analysis may fail.

³The answer to this question brings us to very interesting further lines of enquiry which can be summarized by the question: “why is it that NHE have never made any sets of raw data for blank experiments available for further analysis?” If one considers this question in a naive way, then one would say that there can hardly be any reason for not releasing data sets which do not show any generation of excess enthalpy!

⁴Instead of seeking to establish the correct way(s) of calibrating the systems, the group at NHE used the procedure leading to $(k_R^{t,0})_{362}$, probably coupled to timing errors in the calibration pulse which they did not allow for. Needless to say, this produced nonsensical results which they used as a justification for substituting an invalid method of data analysis. Moreover, this invalid method of data analysis was applied to just two experiments, regarded as being typical, although the fact that there were malfunctions in these experiments has also been pointed out.

SYMBOLS USED

- C – heat capacitance. [$\text{J}(\text{gMole})^{-1}\text{K}^{-1}$]
 $E_c(t)$ – cell voltage at time t . [V]
 $E_{th,b}$ – thermoneutral potential at bath temperature. [V]
 F – Faraday constant. [coulombs(gMole)⁻¹]
 ΔH – rate of enthalpy input. [W]
 ΔH_{ev} – rate of evaporative cooling. [W]
 $\Delta H_{net}(t)$ – rate of net enthalpy input at time t . [W]
 k – heat transfer coefficient. [WK^{-4}]
 L – latent heat of evaporation. [$\text{J}(\text{gMole})^{-1}$]
 M – number of moles of D_2O at $t = 0$.
 P – vapor pressure at the cell temperature. [bar]
 P^* – atmospheric pressure. [bar]
 $Q_f(t)$ – rate of generation of excess enthalpy in the cell at time t . [W]
 t – time. [s]
 α – defined in Eq. (27).
 γ – related to time dependence of the (k) coefficient defined in Eq. (20).
 λ – defined in Eq. (35).
 Λ – defined in Eq. (36).
 τ – time. [s]
 θ – bath temperature. [K]
 $\Delta\theta$ – temperature difference between the cell and the water bath. [K]

SECTION 1: THE EVOLUTION OF THE ICARUS DATA EVALUATION STRATEGIES.

We have in the past used a variety of strategies to evaluate the experimentally determined temperature–time and cell potential–time series. These strategies can be described (at least in part) by the heat transfer coefficients which govern the “Black Box” representing the calorimeters. We will confine attention here to the particular forms of the heat transfer coefficients which were important for the evolution of the data evaluation strategies used with the ICARUS Systems. There is a considerable amount of material which needs to be considered even if we pose this restriction.

The specification of the ICARUS Data Evaluation Strategies [1] (as modified in part in [2]) was based mainly on the analysis of temperature–time and input enthalpy–time series generated by simulations based on the differential equations representing the models of the calorimeters as well as on the evaluation of suitable “blank experiments” (principally using Pt cathodes polarized in 0.1 M LiOD/D₂O), compare [3–6]). For the first of these sets of tests, the validity (or otherwise) of the methods used was judged by the recovery of the parameters used in the simulations at adequately high levels of statistical significance. These tests have now been reconstructed and are described in Section 5 where it will be seen that they were sufficient for the specification of the ICARUS data processing strategies (as well as for the specification of some of the shortcomings of the various methodologies).

The validity (or otherwise) of the methods defined in the first set of tests was then further evaluated by using data for “blank experiments.” This validity was then assessed principally by investigating the degree of conformity with the predictions based on the first set of tests as well as by the statistical significance of the methodologies; by determining the degree of correspondence of the “true” and “lower bound” heat transfer coefficients and, related to this, the observation of a “zero” rate of excess enthalpy generation [4]; by checking the relationship between the various forms of the heat transfer

coefficient [3–6]; and by determining whether the experimentally observed relaxations of the temperature–time series conform to predictions based on simplified models of the calorimeters [4]. One such set of tests for a “blank” experiment carried out using an ICARUS-2 system is described in Section 6 (but excluding the test of the relaxation behavior). The conclusions drawn from tests such as those described in Sections 5 and 6 are summarized in Section 7, where they are compared with the specifications of the experimental protocols and data evaluation strategies contained in the Handbook for the ICARUS-1 Systems [1].

It is perhaps not surprising that most of this material has never been published. We could not imagine that any paper written on this topic would ever be accepted by a scientific journal and believed that it would be sufficient for us to specify the protocols and data evaluation strategies to be used with the ICARUS Systems [1]. It is the deviation of the NHE group from the recommended protocols and their use of inaccurate and/or invalid methods of data evaluation [7] which makes it necessary to reconsider the background material for the ICARUS-1 systems. Unfortunately, such a reconsideration makes it necessary to give a more closely defined description for some of the heat transfer coefficients than has hitherto been used. This is contained in Section 2. We will use the designation $(k'_R)_{i,j,l}$, where $i = 1, 2, 3$ denotes “differential”, “backward integration” and “forward integration” respectively; j is defined in Section 2 and $l = 1, 2$ denotes “lower bound” and “true” respectively. We had hoped to circumvent the need for such an extended description so as to avoid overburdening our accounts with redundant symbolism. Evidently, we were mistaken with our descriptions.

Section 4 describes the method used in the simulations of the data evaluated in Section 5. It will be seen that the first set of tests were incomplete although they were sufficient for the specification of the second set of tests (Section 6) and, in turn, for the specification of the ICARUS protocols and data processing strategies [1].

SECTION 2: DEFINITION OF THE HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENTS.

It is convenient to consider the form of the cell temperature–time series generated by the simulation described in Section 3, Fig. 1. As will be shown in that Section, the data have been generated using Eq. (31) in which the heat transfer from the cell is described as being pseudo - conductive while the effects of “negative feedback” are taken into account by writing the input enthalpy as

$$\text{input enthalpy} = (E - \lambda\Delta\theta)I, \quad (1)$$

where

$$E = E_c(t = 0) - E_{th,b} \quad (2)$$

and

$$\Delta\theta(t) = \theta(t) - \theta_b. \quad (3)$$

However, in order to prepare the way for the consideration of the “blank experiment”, Section 5 as well as the later sections, the heat transfer coefficients are defined by describing the heat transfer as being pseudo-radiative, Eq. (21), giving the “temperature function”

$$f_1(\theta) = [\theta_b + \Delta\theta(t)]^4 - \theta_b^4. \quad (4)$$

For the case of the description of heat transfer being pseudo-conductive, we need to replace the temperature function by $\Delta\theta$,

$$f_1(\theta) = \Delta\theta. \quad (5)$$

We can then define a “lower bound heat transfer coefficient” (i.e., a coefficient which assumes that the rate of excess enthalpy generation is zero) for any part of the measurement cycle, Fig. 1,

$$(k'_R)_{11} = \frac{[E_c(t) - E_{th,b}]I - \Delta H_{ev}(t) - C_p M(d\Delta\theta/dt)}{f_1(\theta)}. \quad (6)$$

In our early work we evaluated this coefficient just before the start of the calibration pulse and designated this particular value as $(k'_R)_4$ (see [8]), a matter which was evidently not understood [9] although the calculation scheme was set out in Appendix 4 of [8]. The special value of $(k'_R)_{11}$ just before the end of the calibration pulse had originally been designated as $(k'_R)_1$. (Together with $(k'_R)_2$ described below, these were the first two coefficients which we used in the data analysis, hence their designation with the suffixes 1 and 2). It was our investigation of the ‘‘Harwell Data Sets’’ [10] which convinced us that the ‘‘lower bound heat transfer coefficient’’ is more useful than just the two special values $(k'_R)_1$ and $(k'_R)_4$ leading to $(k'_R)_{11}$ as derived in the ‘‘ICARUS $(k'_R)_{11}$ -spreadsheets,’’ see Section 6.

Having obtained $(k'_R)_{11}$, we frequently wish to establish the 11-point averages $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$ so as to decrease the ‘‘noise.’’ This gives us *ca* 26 values for measurement cycles lasting 1 day or, better *ca* 52 values for the recommended 2-day cycles. In turn it is useful to evaluate the 6-point averages of $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$ which we have designated as $(\overline{\overline{k'_R}})_{11}$. It is not useful to extend this averaging beyond 6 points because any such extension makes the systematic errors (due to the residual decrease of $(k'_R)_{11}$ with time) larger than the random errors, that is, if the systems are behaving sensibly.

It will become apparent that we need accurate values of C_pM to make $(k'_R)_{11}$ generally useful but, if we exclude regions where the temperature is varying rapidly with time, then ‘‘guesstimates’’ of C_pM are quite adequate. We note that if we rearrange Eq.(6) to the straight line form

$$y = mx + c, \quad (7)$$

i.e.,

$$\frac{[E_c(t) - E_{th,b}]I - \Delta H_{ev}(t)}{f_1(\theta)} = \frac{C_pM(d\Delta\theta/dt)}{f_1(\theta)} + (k'_R)_{1,j,1}, \quad (8)$$

then approximate values of C_pM can be obtained from the slopes of the plots derived for regions where the temperature is varying relatively rapidly with time. We can distinguish four such plots which we have designated by the relevant derived heat transfer coefficients: $(k'_R)^{0}_{151}$, $(k'_R)^{0}_{161}$, $(k'_R)^{0}_{171}$ and $(k'_R)^{0}_{181}$ according to whether the fitting of Eq. (8) is carried at at times somewhat above the origin, at times somewhat above t_1 (the time of application of the calibration pulse), at times somewhat above t_2 (the time of cessation of the calibration pulse) or by the combination of the last two time regions, Fig. 1. However, we note that there is a measure of ambiguity about the interpretation of the values of $(k'_R)_{1,j,1}$ derived, which will be discussed in Sections 5 and 6.

We note here that separate investigations showed that $(d\Delta\theta(t)/dt)$ is best estimated by using the second order central differences (i.e., the chords of the curves) when using ‘‘real’’ data (i.e., experimental rather than simulated data). More accurate values could be derived in principle by using higher order differences. However, in practice, the repeated differentiation of the experimental data leads to an increase in ‘‘noise’’ if we use differences higher than the second order. This use of the central difference is of some

importance when we consider the integration processes required for the derivation of the heat transfer coefficients based on the forward integration of the experimental data (see below).

We note also that objections have often been raised to the procedures which we have adopted based on the fact that we have not “binned the data,” i.e., we have not signal averaged before the data analysis. However, “binning of the data” must always be approached with great caution: one should only “bin data” or “bin coefficients” if these data or coefficients can be expected to be constant over the averaging interval. This is not the case for $(k'_R)_{11}$ unless the effects of the term $C_p M(d\Delta\theta(t)/dt)$ have been taken into account. Once this is done, we can, of course, bin the data as we have done in deriving $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$ and $(\overline{k''_R})_{11}$.

In the case of the interpretation of data derived with calorimeters relying on radiative cooling, the position is further complicated by the fact that the differential equation representing the calorimeters, Eq. (20), is both nonlinear and inhomogeneous. It does not follow therefore that coefficients derived by averaging the data are the same as averages of the coefficients derived by using the raw data. However, we did confirm in 1992 (when this whole saga was first investigated) that we do in fact obtain an equivalence, provided we restrict attention to regions where $(d\Delta\theta(t)/dt)$ is adequately small. We concluded that in such regions the differential Eq. (20) could be sufficiently linearized and that second order small differences were sufficiently small to allow such averaging. However, as the values of $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$ obtained in this way were identical to those obtained following the procedure outlined above, there was evidently no justification in pursuing the matter further (nor to complicate the instrumentation!).

We will refer to the averaging procedures further below when discussing the heat transfer coefficients based on the forward and backward integration procedures. It is next necessary to evaluate the “true heat transfer coefficients.” The value $(k'_R)_2$ near the end of the calibration period is obtained by including the calibration pulse, ΔQ :

$$(k'_R)_2 = \frac{\Delta Q + [E_c(\Delta\theta_2, t_2) - E_c(\Delta\theta_1, t_1)]I - \Delta H_{ev}(\Delta\theta_2, t_2) + \Delta H_{ev}(\Delta\theta_1, t_1)}{f_2(\theta)} - \frac{C_p M [(d\Delta\theta/dt)_{\Delta\theta_2, t_2} - d(\Delta\theta/dt)_{\Delta\theta_1, t_2}]}{f_2(\theta)}, \quad (9)$$

where we now have

$$f_2(\theta) = [\theta_b + (\Delta\theta_2, t_2)]^4 - [\theta_b + (\Delta\theta_1, t_2)]^4. \quad (10)$$

In order to carry out this evaluation, it is useful to construct A4– or A3– sized plots (European notation); see Sections 5 and 6, and then to obtain appropriate averages using a transparent ruler. This type of analysis used to be a generally accepted approach but then fell into disrepute. However, it is now again accepted as giving so-called “robust estimates.”

We note that the errors in $(k'_R)_2$ are measures of the accuracy of the “true heat transfer coefficient” as the estimate is made in terms of the known Joule enthalpy input to the calibration heater. Errors in $(k'_R)_1$ or $(k'_R)_{11}$ are measures of the precision of the “lower bound heat transfer coefficients” as there is no independent calibration and there may be excess enthalpy generation in the system. It is important that $(k'_R)_{11}$ and $(k'_R)_2$ are the least precise and least accurate coefficients, which can be obtained from the raw data.⁵

We have always insisted that the construction and evaluation of plots of the raw data is an essential prerequisite of the more elaborate data evaluation procedures. For one thing, it shows whether the “noise levels” in the experiments were sufficiently low to justify more detailed evaluations and also points to malfunctions in the operation of the experiments. It is very important therefore to establish whether the group at NHE ever followed this particular instruction and, if they did, what conclusions they may have drawn from any such plots.

Having obtained the “true heat transfer coefficient” at a single point (usually near the end of the calibration pulse), it is important to ask: “what is the true heat transfer coefficient $(k'_R)_{12}$ at any other time?” We can make such an evaluation within the duration $t_1 < t < t_2$ of the calibration pulse simply by using Eq. (9), giving $(k'_R)_{12}$ rather than $(k'_R)_2$. Note also that Eq. (9) can be rearranged to the straight line form

⁵Any statements that the errors are larger than this (as has been made, for example, in the paper from the group at NHE [7]) simply show that mistakes have been made in the data analysis procedures and/or the execution of the experiments.

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\Delta Q + [E_c(\Delta\theta_2, t) - E_c(\Delta\theta_1, t)]I - \Delta H_{ev}(\Delta\theta_2, t) + \Delta H_{ev}(\Delta\theta_1, t)}{f_2(\theta)} \\ &= \frac{C_p M [(d\Delta\theta/dt)_{\Delta\theta_2, t} - (d\Delta\theta/dt)_{\Delta\theta_1, t}]}{f_2(\theta)} + (k'_R)^{I,0}_{162}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

which is applicable to times close to and above t_1 . It is evident, therefore, that such data derived from the experiments can also be used to obtain estimates of $C_p M$, but the accuracy of such values is inevitably much lower than of those obtained by the application of the corresponding expression for the “lower bound heat transfer coefficient,” $(k'_R)^{I,0}_{161}$, Eq. (8). Nevertheless, Eq. (11) is useful because it allows the removal of the effects of the water equivalent on the “true heat transfer coefficient,” $(k'_R)^{I,0}_{162}$, simply by extrapolating to zero value of the abscissa.

In the regions in which there is no application of the heater pulse, i.e., for $0 < t < t_1$ and $t_2 < t < T$, the “true heat transfer coefficient” can only be obtained from the “heating” and “cooling curves,” i.e., the “driving force” is the change in the enthalpy content of the calorimeters rather than ΔQ . It is now sensible to cast Eq. (9) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{C_p M [(d\Delta\theta/dt)_{\Delta\theta_2, t} - (d\Delta\theta/dt)_{\Delta\theta_1, t}]}{f_2(\theta)} = -(k'_R)^{I,0}_{152} \\ & + \frac{[E_c(\Delta\theta_2, t) - E_c(\Delta\theta_1, t)]I - \Delta H_{ev}(\Delta\theta_2, t) + \Delta H_{ev}(\Delta\theta_1, t)}{f_2(\theta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

If the system is functioning correctly, then it will be found that the L.H.S. of Eq. (12) is essentially constant (although this constancy can only be probed over a short time range). The second term on the R.H.S. of Eq. (12) will be much smaller than the term on the L.H.S., i.e., it is in the nature of a correction term to give the “point-by-point” values of $(k'_R)^{I,0}_{152}$ or $(k'_R)^{I,0}_{172}$. It will be evident that the accuracy of these versions of the “true heat transfer coefficient” is limited by the accuracy of our estimates of $C_p M$. This particular part of the methodology is therefore only useful to serve as a check on the operation of the cells and methods of data evaluation.⁶ The importance of Eqs. (11) and (12) lies partly in the fact that these equations lead to the interpretation of what we have classified as Cases 1 and 2 of the phenomenon of “Heat after Death”[3] (and to other related versions of these Cases).

The assumption underlying this part of the account is that we can only determine $(k'_R)^{I,0}_{12}$ within the duration of application of the calibration pulse, $t_1 < t < t_2$, Fig 1, and at lower accuracy, $(k'_R)^{I,0}_{152}$ and $(k'_R)^{I,0}_{172}$, in regions adjacent to the origin and for times adjacent and above t_2 . However, this conclusion is incorrect. We

⁶It is not possible to combine the data in the regions just above t_1 and t_2 to give a simple equation leading to $(k'_R)^{I,0}_{182}$, at least we should say that we have not been able to specify a simple data processing strategy!

need to make the additional assumption that the rate of any excess enthalpy generation is constant during any particular calibration period in order to determine $(k'_R)_{12}$. This means that we can only obtain a single value of this heat transfer coefficient per calibration period and, consequently, a single value of $(k'_R)_{12} - (k'_R)_{11}$. Two important points follow from this conclusion. In the first place, the precision of $(k'_R)_{12}$ must be very nearly equal to the precision of $(k'_R)_{11}$ (this is discussed further in Section 6). Secondly, if we extend the assumption that the rate of excess enthalpy generation is constant during the period $t_1 < t < t_2$ to saying that it is constant during the period $0 < t < T$, then it is immediately possible to derive $(k'_R)_{12}$ over the whole of the measurement cycle. The values obtained can be compared to the special values of $(k'_R)^{0}_{152}$ and $(k'_R)^{0}_{172}$ in the relevant time regions.

Having obtained the local (differential) values of the “lower bound” and “true heat transfer coefficient,” we naturally cast around for methods which would increase their precision and accuracy. The reason for the limited precision and accuracy is mainly due to the need to differentiate the noisy experimental data sets. In our early work, we overcame this particular difficulty by using $(k'_R)_4$ and $(k'_R)_2$ as starting values for the nonlinear regression procedure leading to the heat transfer coefficient $(k'_R)_5$. Here, we fitted the numerical integrals of the differential equation governing the behavior of the calorimeters to the data sets for complete measurements cycles. The relative errors in $(k'_R)_5$ which we could achieve in this way were below 0.1%, even when using the unsatisfactory early version of our calorimeters (i.e., those not silvered in their top portions).

The use of nonlinear regression procedure had the further distinct advantage that we could adjust the integration interval in regions where the temperature was varying rapidly with time so as to achieve the required accuracy in the integrals. This is not possible for the methods which we will discuss below (and which were part of the ICARUS data processing strategy) because the intervals for the data acquisition were fixed. As a matter of fact, the interval 300 s was chosen because such an interval does not degrade the evaluation of any of the series $(k'_R)_{21}$, $(k'_R)_{22}$, $(k'_R)^{0}_{251}$, $(k'_R)^{0}_{252}$, $(k'_R)^{0}_{261}$, $(k'_R)^{0}_{262}$, $(k'_R)^{0}_{271}$, and $(k'_R)^{0}_{272}$. However, it does degrade the evaluation of $(k'_R)_{31}$, $(k'_R)^{0}_{351}$, $(k'^{0R})_{361}$, and $(k'_R)^{0}_{371}$ to some extent, and leads to a marked degradation of $(k'_R)_{32}$, $(k'_R)^{0}_{352}$, $(k'_R)^{0}_{362}$, and $(k'_R)^{0}_{372}$. The fact that the data acquisition interval was too long for straightforward estimations of the $(k'_R)_{3,j,l}$ series of heat transfer coefficients was already pointed out to NHE in the ICARUS-1 Handbook [1]. These matters will be considered further in Sections 5 and 6.

We have pointed out on other occasions that the reason we opted for using nonlinear regression fitting in our early work was because the pressure of events did not allow us to go through the logical sequence of using linear regression, multilinear regression and nonlinear regression (in fact, we had to opt for a “catch-all” methodology). However, as we could not make nonlinear regression “user friendly” with the computing power

then available to us, so in 1991–92, we investigated the application of linear regression, which became part and parcel of the ICARUS-1 methodology.⁷

Attention has been drawn to some of these details because it would certainly be possible to reimplement parts of these projects provided one could gain access to the data sets. If one wishes to avoid the numerical differentiation of the experimental data sets, then one can rely instead on the numerical integrations of these data and compare these to the integrals of the differential equation representing the model of the calorimeters. For the backward integrals starting from the end of the measurement cycles at $t = T$, we obtain

$$(k'_R)_{21} = \frac{\int_T^t \Delta H_{net}(\tau) d\tau}{\int_T^t f_1(\theta) d\tau} - \frac{C_p M [\Delta\theta(t) - \Delta\theta(T)]}{\int_T^t f_1(\theta) d\tau} \quad (13)$$

while the corresponding equation for forward integration from the start of the measurement cycle is

$$(k'_R)_{32} = \frac{\int_0^t \Delta H_{net}(\tau) d\tau}{\int_0^t f_1(\theta) d\tau} - \frac{C_p M [\Delta\theta(t) - \Delta\theta(0)]}{\int_0^t f_1(\theta) d\tau}. \quad (14)$$

Here, the suffices 21 and 31 denote respectively “backward integration, lower bound” and “forward integration, lower bound.” $(k'_R)_{21}$ and $(k'_R)_{31}$ are the corresponding integral heat transfer coefficients defined at the time t .

We note here that care is needed when integrating the term [net enthalpy input, $\Delta H_{net}(\tau)$] around the discontinuities at $t = t_1$ and $t = t_2$. This is a matter which will be considered further in Sections 5 and 6. In our work we have at various times used the trapezium rule, Simpson’s rule, or the mid-point rule to carry out the integrations. Of these rules, only the mid-point rule is strictly speaking correct in that it agrees with the mathematical definition of an integral. It is quite generally assumed that integrations carried out using the trapezium or Simpson’s rule will converge onto the “correct” algebraic result if the integration interval is made adequately small, but this does not necessarily follow. It is a matter which needs to be investigated for each particular case.

The merits of the particular integration procedures coupled to the adequacy of the chosen integration interval is revealed more clearly when we come to the use of Eqs. (13) and (14) to determine $C_p M$ and to carry out extrapolations to remove the effects of the

⁷While dealing with these “historical aspects,” we note also that in 1990-92 we investigated the use of Kalman filtering (leading to an heat transfer coefficient labelled as $(k'_R)_6$ and we also investigated the use of other filtering methods. Some of this was rather promising especially that designed to extract information about “positive feedback,” but these projects had to be abandoned. As part of these projects we also investigated the use of averaging techniques other than the “square-box” version, which gives $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$ from $k'_R)_{11}$ and $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$ from $(k'_R)_{11}$. These projects were also promising, but again had to be abandoned. Finally, in 1994, the change of the ICARUS systems to hardware based switching was investigated with a view to allowing changes in the data acquisition intervals (thereby putting the $(k'_R)_{3,j,l}$ strategies on a sounder basis). However, these switching systems were not incorporated in the ICARUS–2 systems.

second term on the R.H.S. of Eqs. (13) and (14) on the corresponding heat transfer coefficients. We will follow here the procedure laid down in the ICARUS-1 Handbook [1] where the integrations were restricted to the region of application of the heater calibration pulse. For backward integration, we obtain

$$\frac{\int_{t_2}^t \Delta H_{net}(\tau) d\tau}{\int_{t_2}^t f_1(\theta) d\tau} = \frac{C_p M [\Delta\theta(t) - \Delta\theta(t_2)]}{\int_{t_2}^t f_1(\theta) d\tau} + (k'_R)^{t,0}_{261} \quad (15)$$

while for the forward integration we have

$$\frac{\int_{t_1}^t \Delta H_{net}(\tau) d\tau}{\int_{t_1}^t f_1(\theta) d\tau} = \frac{C_p M [\Delta\theta(t) - \Delta\theta(t_2)]}{\int_{t_1}^t f_1(\theta) d\tau} + (k'_R)^{t,0}_{361}. \quad (16)$$

It will be seen in Sections 5 and 6 (more especially in Section 6) that Eq. (15) can be used to derive accurate values of $C_p M$ while there is some minor degradation when using the forward integration, Eq. (16). The application of Eq. (15) to the data sets was the “target methodology” of the ICARUS systems and the derived “lower bound heat transfer coefficient,” $(k'_R)^{t,0}_{261}$ was described as $(k'_R)_{21}$ in the Handbook [1] and the associated correspondence. The same types of equation may be used to derive $(k'_R)^{t,0}_{251}$, $(k'_R)^{t,0}_{271}$, and $(k'_R)^{t,0}_{281}$ as well as $(k'_R)^{t,0}_{351}$, $(k'_R)^{t,0}_{371}$, and $(k'_R)^{t,0}_{381}$; it is only necessary to start the interpretation from the appropriate times, which also give the starting values of θ for the R.H.S. of the relevant equations. Of these sets of estimates, that leading to $(k'_R)^{t,0}_{281}$ is especially useful and this particular fit also gives a good estimate of $C_p M$.

In order to obtain the “true heat transfer coefficients” it is necessary to combine the integrals of the enthalpy inputs in Eqs. (15) and (16) with thermal balances made at one or a series of points.⁸ We will confine attention here to the procedure originally suggested in the Handbook for the ICARUS-1 system[1]. We make a thermal balance just before the application of the calibration pulse and, if the system has relaxed adequately and, if $d\theta/dt = 0$, then if we consider $(k'_R)_{32}$,

$$0 = [\Delta H_{net}(t_1)][t - t_1] + Q_f[t - t_1] - (k'_R)_{32}[(\theta_b + \Delta\theta(t_1))^4 - \theta_b^4][t - t_1] \quad (17)$$

Combination with Eq. (14) eliminates the unknown rate of excess enthalpy generation, Q_f . We obtain

$$(k'_R)_{32} = \frac{\int_{t_1}^t \Delta H_{net}(\tau) d\tau - [\Delta H_{net}(t_1)][t - t_1]}{\int_{t_1}^t f_2(\theta) d\tau} - \frac{C_p M [\Delta\theta(t) - \Delta\theta(t_1)]}{\int_{t_1}^t f_2(\theta) d\tau}. \quad (18)$$

⁸This can be done in a number of ways and it is important that this part of the evaluation was changed during the summer of 1994 following the receipt of the first two sets of data collected by NHE.

The corresponding equation for $(k'_R)_{22}$ follows from Eq. (18) on replacing t_1 by t_2 .⁹

The corresponding equation for $(k'_R)_{22}$, based on the backward integration of the data sets, follows from Eq. (18) on replacing t_1 by t_2 . It is also convenient to rewrite the derived equation in the straight line form:

$$\frac{\int_{t_2}^t \Delta H_{net}(\tau) d\tau - [\Delta H_{net}(t_2)][t - t_2]}{\int_{t_2}^t f_2(\theta) d\tau} = \frac{C_p M [\Delta\theta(t) - \Delta\theta(t_2)]}{\int_{t_2}^t f_2(\theta) d\tau} + (k'_R)^{0}_{262}. \quad (19)$$

$(k'_R)^{0}_{262}$ was the version of $(k'_R)_{22}$, which we used in our investigations prior to the construction of the ICARUS-1 system. As we did not want to discuss the differences between these two versions, we also labelled $(k'_R)^{0}_{262}$ with the suffices 22. It should be noted that Eq. (19) is soundly based (in a mathematical sense) in that the extrapolation to $[\Delta\theta(t) - \Delta\theta(t_2)] = 0$ gives the value of $(k'_R)^{0}_{262}$ at a well defined time, $t = t_2$. This extrapolation automatically removes the effect of the term $C_p M [(\theta(t) - \theta(t_2))] / \int_{t_2}^t f_2(\theta) d\tau$ on the heat transfer coefficient. This was one objective for our methodology because $C_p M$ is the, least accurate parameter in the analysis; the application of Eq. (19) to the data sets was the “target methodology” for evaluating the “true heat transfer coefficients.”

While it is also possible to write Eq. (18) in the form (19) to give $(k'_R)^{0}_{362}$, this method of analysis is not useful as the range of the extrapolation required is too long as will be shown in Sections 5 and 6. For this reason we recommended in the Handbook [1] that $(k'_R)_{32}$ be evaluated at times close to $t = t_2$ using Eq. (18). However, in view of the errors in the determination of $C_p M$, these values of $(k'_R)_{32}$ are inevitably less accurate than those of $(k'_R)^{0}_{262}$.

We note here also that one must be somewhat careful in carrying out the required linear regression fitting procedures, a matter which is considered further in Sections 5 and 6.

⁹We note that NHE did not follow the instruction in the ICARUS-1 Handbook [1] to use 2-day measurement cycles and, for the reduced time scales of 1-day cycles in particular, it is necessary to include the term $C_p M (d\Delta\theta/dt)$ in the thermal balances, Eq. (17). However, NHE continued to use the original form of the equation. They also did not follow the instruction to evaluate $(k'_R)_{32}$ at times close to t_2 .

SECTION 3: DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS GOVERNING THE BEHAVIOR OF THE CALORIMETERS: SIMULATIONS OF THE TEMPERATURE-TIME SERIES.

It has been established that at low to intermediate cell temperatures (say, $30 < \theta < 80^{\circ}\text{C}$) the behavior of the calorimeters is modelled adequately by the differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} C_p M (d\Delta\theta/dt) = & [E_c(t) - E_{th,b}]I + Q_f(t) + [\Delta QH(t - t_1) - \Delta QH(t - t_2)] \\ & - (3I/4F) [(P/P^* - P)] [(C_{p,D_2O,g} - C_{p,D_2O,l})\Delta\theta + L] \\ & - (k_R^0)\theta_b^3 [1 - \gamma] [f_1(\theta)/\theta_b^3 + 4\phi\Delta\theta]. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

With the calorimeters used in the ICARUS-type investigations, the conductive contribution to heat transfer is small. We have therefore assumed that this term can be “lumped” into the radiative term by allowing a small increase in the radiative heat transfer coefficient:

$$\text{radiative heat transfer} = (k_R^{\prime 0}) [1 - \gamma] [(\theta_b + \Delta\theta)^4 - \theta_b^4]. \quad (21)$$

If the time dependence of the heat transfer coefficient is not included explicitly in this equation, then

$$\text{radiative heat transfer} = (k_R^{\prime}) [(\theta_b + \Delta\theta)^4 - \theta_b^4], \quad (22)$$

where the radiative heat transfer coefficient (k_R^{\prime}) now shows a weak time dependence.

In calculating the rate of enthalpy removal by the gas stream,

$$(3I/4F)[P/(P^* - P)][(C_{p,D_2O,g} - C_{p,D_2O,l})\Delta\theta + L], \quad (23)$$

we have always assumed that the partial pressure of D_2O (or H_2O) in this gas stream can be calculated using the Clausius-Clapeyron equation with the latent heat of evaporation, L , being that at the boiling point. Evaporative cooling only becomes a major term at

temperatures close to the boiling point (say, at $\Delta\theta > 70^{\circ}\text{C}$) where these two assumptions are justified. At low to intermediate temperatures, $\Delta H_{ev}(t)$ is a minor correction term so that errors due to the two assumptions introduce second order small quantities (for a further approximation, see below).

In carrying out simulations to be analyzed by the methods outlined in Section 2, we have further usually assumed that the rate of excess enthalpy generation is zero,

$$Q_f(t) = 0, \quad (24)$$

and that the radiative heat transfer term can be linearized: rate of heat transfer,

$$4(k'_R)\theta_b^3\Delta\theta = (k'_c)\Delta\theta, \quad (25)$$

i.e., that the heat transfer is now pseudo-conductive. This is an assumption which we also used (with several restrictions) in our original investigation [8]. We note here that the heat transfer coefficients for the Dewar cells used at that time were up to twice those which are calculated from the Stefan-Boltzmann coefficient and the radiative surface area so that we had to assume that the conductive contribution was appreciable. We attributed this conductive contribution to conduction across the nominal vacuum gap due to inadequate evacuation/baking of the Dewars. It was therefore not clear whether the heat transfer term should be described as being pseudo-radiative or pseudo-conductive and the experiments had to be carried out in such a way that the errors due to the limiting assumptions were below those of the experiment. In our later work (including that carried out with the ICARUS systems), we ensured that the vacuum in the Dewars was sufficiently hard so that the radiative heat transfer coefficient was now given by the product of the Stefan-Boltzmann coefficient and the radiative surface area. However, it is evident that the vacuum in some of the cells used in the NHE investigations had become rather soft.

The correct description of heat transfer from the cell is a matter which requires further investigation. While the limiting assumptions introduce small errors, we can ensure that these errors are less than those due to the experiment. It is therefore better to use these assumptions rather than to attempt to separate this term into the radiative and conductive contributions. However, a better approach might well be that we should calculate the radiative term and then derive the conductive contribution from the calibrations [3]. This would ensure that we do not introduce an additional parameter into the modeling of the cells. It should be noted that such a methodology would automatically ensure the linearization of Eq. (20). In carrying out such modified procedures, we should weight the radiative contribution appropriately (say 95% of the total) rather than using the 50:50 split of the original analysis [3].

The use of the descriptions and assumptions outlined above gives us the differential equation

$$C_p M^0 (d\Delta\theta/dt) = [E_c(t) - E_{th,b}]I + Q_f(t) + \Delta QH(t - t_1) - \Delta QH(t - t_2) -$$

$$\Delta H_{ev}(t) - (k_R^{i,0})[1 - \gamma][(\theta_b + \Delta\theta)^4 - \theta_b^4]. \quad (26)$$

In order to calculate the $\Delta\theta - t$ series we have to deal with a further difficulty in that the function $E_c(t)$ is unknown. However, it is evident from the experimental $\Delta\theta(t) - t$ and $E_c(t) - t$ series that we can always observe “negative feedback,” i.e., that E_c decreases with $\Delta\theta$. If we assume that this is the only cause of the variation of E_c with t , then

$$E_c(t) = E_c(0) - \alpha(\Delta\theta - \Delta\theta^0) = E_c' - \alpha\Delta\theta \quad (27)$$

(i.e., we neglect any variation of the activation overpotentials with time) and

$$\begin{aligned} C_p M(d\Delta\theta/dt) = [E_c' - E_{th,b} - \alpha\Delta\theta]I + Q_f(t) + [\Delta QH(t - t_1) - \Delta QH(t - t_2)] \\ - \Delta H_{ev}(t) - (k_R^{i,0})(1 - \gamma)[(\theta_b + \Delta\theta_b)^4 - \theta_b^4]. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

It was not clear during 1991-92 whether we should change our data processing strategy to that later incorporated into the ICARUS systems or whether we should continue to use nonlinear regression fitting. At that time, we therefore investigated further the possibility of obtaining an analytic solution of Eq. (27) so as to speed up the latter procedure. Such a solution was derived and it was shown that the numerical integration of Eq. (28) agreed with this solution to better than 0.1%, the target figure for our data analyses (these solutions required the assumption $Q_f(t) = \text{constant}$, which is in any event necessary so as to achieve calibrations of the systems). We believe that the residual discrepancy is due to deficiencies in the numerical techniques, i.e., that the analytic solutions are exact. This program of work was discontinued when it became clear that satisfactory data analysis could be achieved by using linear regression procedures. However, it may well be that this particular aspect of the data analysis procedures should be restarted if we wish to develop a general investigation of existing data sets.

At that time, we also investigated the application of various data evaluation procedures to simulated data sets. Attention was confined to linearized versions of Eq. (28) with the additional assumptions,

$$Q_f(t) = 0 \quad (29)$$

$$\Delta H_{ev}(t) = 0, \quad (30)$$

giving the equation,

$$C_p M (d\Delta\theta/dt) = E_c^l I + [\Delta QH(t-t_1) - \Delta QH(t-t_2)] - (k_c'^0)[1 - \gamma] \Delta\theta - \alpha I \Delta\theta. \quad (31)$$

With the additional assumption that the pseudo-conductive heat transfer coefficient is independent of time we have

$$C_p M (d\Delta\theta/dt) = E_c^l I + [\Delta QH(t-t_1) - \Delta QH(t-t_2)] - (k_c'^0 + \alpha I) \Delta\theta. \quad (32)$$

Parts of these investigations have now been repeated. The integrations of (32) follow immediately. For the initial condition

$$\Delta\theta = \Delta\theta_i, \quad t = 0, \quad (33)$$

we obtain

$$\Delta\theta = \Delta\theta_i e^{-\lambda t} + \Lambda_1 (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \quad (34)$$

where

$$\lambda = (k_c'^0 + \alpha I) / C_p M \quad (35)$$

and

$$\Lambda_1 = E_c^l I / (k_c'^0 + \alpha I) \quad (36)$$

i.e., in the region $0 < t < t_1$. We assume

$$C_p M^0 = 330 JK^{-1} \quad (37)$$

$$k_c'^0 = 0.073 WK^{-1} \quad (38)$$

$$\gamma I = 0.007 WK^{-1} \quad (39)$$

$$\Delta\theta_i = 11.75^0 C \quad (40)$$

$$E_c^l I = \gamma I \Delta\theta_i = 1 W. \quad (41)$$

With the exception of the rather low value of $\Delta\theta_i$, these parameters are close to those which we would derive for the blank experiment discussed in Section 6. The reason why $\Delta\theta_i$ has been set artificially low is so as to allow an examination of the region close to $t = 0$. With (36) through (40), we obtain from Eq. (34)

$$\Delta\theta = 13.528125 - 1.778125 e^{[-0.000(24.)t]} \quad (42)$$

while the enthalpy input is given by

$$\text{input enthalpy} = 0.987553 + 0.012447 \exp[-0.000(24.)t]. \quad (43)$$

Here (24.) denotes the recurrence of the number group 24.

We next use (41) to give the value of $\Delta\theta_1$ at $t = t_1 = 43,200s$

$$\Delta\theta_1 = 13.528075^0C \text{ at } t = 43,200s. \quad (44)$$

This value is adequately close to 13.528125^0C , which applies to complete thermal relaxation. We use this value together with

$$\Delta Q = 0.2W, \quad t_1 < t < t_2 \quad (45)$$

for the next step of the integration. With

$$\Lambda_2 = (E'_c I + \Delta Q) / (k'_c{}^0 + \alpha I) \quad (46)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\theta &= \Delta\theta_1 e^{-\lambda(t-t_1)} + \Lambda_2 [1 - e^{-\lambda(t-t_1)}] \\ &= 16.028125 - 2.500050e^{[-0.000(24.)(t-t_1)]}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

and

$$\text{input enthalpy} = 0.970053 + 0.017500e^{[-0.000(24.)(t-t_1)]} \quad (48)$$

Equation (47) can be used in turn to derive

$$\Delta\theta_2 = 16.028049^0C \text{ at } (t_2 - t_1) = 42,900s, \quad (49)$$

which is used as the initial value for the final step in the integration. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\theta &= \Delta\theta_2 e^{-\lambda(t-t_2)} + \Lambda_1 [1 - e^{-\lambda(t-t_2)}] \\ &= 13.528125 + 2.499924e^{[-0.000(24.)(t-t_2)]} \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

and

$$\text{input enthalpy} = 0.987553 - 0.017499e^{[-0.000(24.)(t-t_2)]}. \quad (51)$$

The “raw data” calculated using Eqs. (42), (43), (47), (48), (50), and (51) are given in the ICARUS $(k'_c{}^0)_{11}$ spreadsheet, spreadsheet 1. These data are analyzed in Section 5 using the methodologies outlined in Section 3. It will be seen that simulations of this kind are adequate for demonstrating the advantages and shortcomings of the various possible methods. It will also be clear that such simulations are deficient in several important respects. In the first place the residual time dependence of the heat transfer coefficient has not been taken into account. However, it was confirmed in 1992 that a data set generated with approximate solutions which include this effect does indeed generate the key features observed when using “real experimental data,” see Section 6. We note here that data sets have never yet been generated using the full analytic solution described above. Secondly, the effects of “noise” having defined characteristics (i.e., defined power spectral densities as well as the effects of quantization of the measurements) on the methods of data evaluation has never yet been investigated. Instead, we have relied on a comparison of the analysis of simulated data, Section 5, with those for “blank” experiments, Section 6. If the question of the effects of “noise” ever becomes an important issue, then we would suggest that the “noise” characteristics of $E_c(t)$ and $\Delta\theta(t)$ be first determined and that data be then generated using the full analytic solution with addition of the correct “noise” characteristics.

SECTION 4: SPECIFICATION OF THE ICARUS-1 EXPERIMENTAL PROTOCOLS AND DATA EVALUATION PROCEDURES.

Before dealing with the analysis of the simulated data, Section 5, and the analysis of data for a “blank” experiment, Section 6, we will outline the experimental protocols and data evaluation strategies specified for experiments with the ICARUS systems. The key elements were as follows:

(i) the measurement cycles should be lengthened to 48 hours. Following the replenishment of the D₂O (or H₂O) in the cells to make up for losses due to electrolysis, the relaxation of the systems was to be followed for 12 hours followed by the application of a Joule heating pulse for a further 12 hours (when this calibration was required) in turn followed by a final relaxation for a further 24-hour period.

(ii) the protocols were to be:

- (a) two measurement cycles without calibration pulses;
- (b) ten measurement cycles with calibration pulses;
- (c) two measurement cycles without calibration pulses;
- (d) ten measurement cycles with calibration pulses.

It will be seen that a total experiment duration of 48 days was specified;

(iii) several “blank experiments” were to be carried out (at least one for each cell in use; the use of Pt cathodes in 0.1M LiOD/D₂O was recommended). The protocol (ii) was to be followed.

(iv) the execution of the “blank experiments” was to be followed by experiments using cathodes made of Johnson Matthey Material Type A. The protocol (ii) was again to be followed;

(v) the first step in the data evaluation was to be the plotting of A3- or A4- sized graphs of the raw data. The heat transfer coefficients $(k'_R)_1$ and $(k'_R)_2$ were to be derived for each measurement cycle.

(vi) the next step was to be the construction of $(k'_R)_{11}$ -type spreadsheets coupled to the determination and interpretation of $(k'_R)_{11}$, $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$ and $(\overline{\overline{k'_R}})_{11}$. The further evaluation of these spreadsheets was not specified in 1993; this was a matter which was to be decided by a collaborative program between NHE and IMRA Europe.

(vii) after the execution of (vi), the $(k'_R)_{21}$ -type spreadsheets were to be prepared and values of $(k'^0_R)_{261}$ and $(k'^0_R)_{361}$ and the associated values of $C_p M$ were to be determined. These values of $C_p M$ were to be used both to correct the evaluations in (vi) and to determine the “true” heat transfer coefficients $(k'_R)_{32}$ at times close to the end of the calibration period, $t = t_2$;

(viii) it was envisaged that, following the completion of this initial stage of the investigation, the ICARUS program would move on to the examination of materials variables as well as the production of ICARUS-2. This second part was intended to deal with the effects of increasing the current density, the analysis of data close to the boiling point (including the boiling episodes), and “Heat after Death.”

After the receipt of the data for the first set of experiments carried out in the NHE Laboratories, it became apparent that there were timing errors in the ICARUS-1 system installed in Sapporo [1]. The most self-evident error was in the timing of the application and cessation of the calibration pulses (t_1 and t_2), which degraded somewhat the estimation of $(k'_R)_{31}$ and caused a serious degradation of the evaluation of $(k'_R)_{32}$. The estimations of $(k'_R)_{21}$ and $(k'_R)_{22}$ were not affected by these errors (as had been the case for the experiments carried out prior to the construction of the ICARUS-1 system). It was therefore recommended [16] that (vii) be modified and that the “true heat transfer coefficient” be estimated using $(k'_R)_{22}$ evaluated at times close to t_1 and by $(k'^0_R)_{262}$ (rather than by $(k'_R)_{32}$ estimated at times close to t_2 as recommended in the Handbook for the ICARUS-1 system [1]).

This set of objectives and instructions will be reconsidered in Section 7 in the light of the evaluation of the simulated data, Section 5, and of a “blank” experiment, Section 6.

SECTION 5: EVALUATION OF THE “RAW DATA” GENERATED USING THE SIMULATION DESCRIBED IN SECTION 4.

(a) We start by plotting the “raw data” generated by the simulation Eqs. (42), (43), (47), (48), (50), and (51) described in Section 3; see the ICARUS $(k'_c)_{11}$ -spreadsheet, spreadsheet 1. The plots of the temperature–time and input enthalpy–time series are shown in Fig. 2 (the data are the same as in Fig. 1). We evaluate $(k'_c)_1$ and $(k'_c)_2$ using the graphical method and obtain

$$(k'_c)_1 = 0.07294WK^{-1} \quad (52)$$

$$(k'_c)_2 = 0.07280WK^{-1}. \quad (53)$$

It should be noted that the scale of the y-axis in Fig. 2 is markedly reduced compared to that used in the evaluation of experimental data, e.g., Fig. 38. The reasons for this are the rather low value of $\Delta\theta_i$ used in the simulation (Eq. (39)) which increases the excursion of the temperature–time series coupled to use of landscape rather than portrait format so as to allow the presentation of the whole of the measurement cycle. In view of this compressed scale, the accuracies of $(k'_c)_1$ and $(k'_c)_2$ are somewhat reduced compared to those normally achieved. This effect is to some extent counteracted by the absence of “noise” in the simulated data.

At this stage, we have also always prepared a diagram on a much larger scale of the regions straddling the times t_1 and t_2 such as that shown in Fig. 3. There are several reasons for preparing such diagrams. First of all, when dealing with experimental data collected with the ICARUS systems (and their precursors), it is important to determine the exact times of application and cessation of the calibration pulses. It was the preparation of such diagrams which showed that there were timing errors in the ICARUS-1 system which could be easily allowed for by deriving the exact values of t_1 and t_2 . As has already been stated on other occasions there was no point in changing the hardware

to correct for these effects as the times of data acquisition were known with sufficient accuracy.

Of course, when dealing with the simulated data, t_1 and t_2 are known exactly and these times should also be known accurately for experimental data collected with the ICARUS-2 system. However, we believe that this assumption/prediction will turn out to be incorrect!

The second reason for investigating the temperature–time series in these time regions is to define the time series required for the integrations of the input enthalpy to be used in the $(k'_R)_{21}$ –spreadsheets. This definition is in turn dependent on the methods to be used for the numerical integrations. Here, we will assume here that we have decided to use the trapezium or sum rules for the integrations (these methods are related because the values given by the trapezium rule are those derived by the sum rule less one half the terms at the extremes of the range multiplied by the integration interval). For these rules, we need to insert an additional point into the experimental data at t_1 and t_2 if these times correspond to the data acquisition intervals. If t_1 and t_2 do not correspond to these intervals, we need to insert two additional points at each of t_1 and t_2 .

We note here that the trapezium and sum rules can be used in a straightforward way to integrate around the discontinuities at t_1 and t_2 . The mid-point and Simpson’s rule cannot be used in this way: in particular, it is necessary to use much more complicated procedures if we wish to use the mathematically exact central difference methods. For this reason, we have always relied on the trapezium or sum rules except if the integrations are confined to regions $0 < t < t_1, t_1 < t < t_2$ or $t_2 < t < T$.¹⁰

(b) The next step is to carry out a detailed examination of the $(k'_c)_{11}$ – spreadsheet, spreadsheet 1 and this examination itself falls into several parts. We first of all plot the lower bound heat transfer coefficient, $(k'_c)_{11}$, against time (here given by the measurement interval) where we use the assumed value of C_pM , Fig. 4. Of course, for the case of the interpretation of the simulated data, we know the value of C_pM used in the simulation. The deviation of $(k'_c)_{11}$ from the value 0.073000 WK^{-1} used in the simulation is therefore an indication of the errors in $d\Delta\theta/dt$ produced by using the second order central difference when using a 300 s measurement interval. We can see that we can obtain reasonable values of $(k'_c)_{11}$ provided we exclude, say, the first six hours following any

¹⁰We believe that these integrations have been carried out incorrectly by the ICARUS-2 software. It would be important to check this particular point if we can reimplement the software. The reason is not only that incorrect integrations will lead to incorrect values of the “true heat transfer coefficient,” a matter which will be illustrated below, but also that we will calculate an incorrect value of the excess enthalpy for each measurement cycle even if we should have a correct value for the heat transfer coefficient! If we cannot reimplement the software, then we will be able to make some sort of overall check of the ICARUS-2 software by carrying out correct and detailed checks of the measurement cycles for which NHE have given values of the “true heat transfer coefficient” evaluated by their methodology. This should automatically reveal the method(s) they actually used to arrive at their conclusions.

change in the operating conditions of the cells.

Of course, in the case of the evaluation of spreadsheets derived for experimental measurements, our first evaluation will be based on a “guesstimate” of C_pM . It will therefore be necessary to amend the spreadsheet once an accurate value of C_pM has been derived.¹¹ It is important that under such conditions the further average $(\overline{k'_c})_{11}$ cannot be derived and $(\overline{k'_c})_{11}$ is quite meaningless. It is therefore impossible to carry out these important averaging methods which reduce the effects of random errors. These difficulties could have been avoided if the experiments had been carried out using the stipulated 48-hour measurement cycles.

We note that the error of 0.04% in the “lower bound heat transfer coefficient” is above that which was specified for the ICARUS-1 system (0.01%). An alternative approach to removing the errors due to incorrect estimates of C_pM is to use the evaluations of $(k_c^{l,0})_{151}$, $(k_c^{l,0})_{161}$, $(k_c^{l,0})_{171}$, and $(k_c^{l,0})_{181}$, Figs. 5 through 8. These extrapolations automatically give us values of C_pM and the relevant values of the “lower bound heat transfer coefficients” are shown on Fig. 4.

This particular approach was de-emphasized in setting up the ICARUS-1 system because the extrapolations in Figs. 5 through 8 are to a point where $d\Delta\theta/dt = 0$. While this condition is satisfied for the simulations, it will not be observed for experiments carried out with a 24-hour measurement cycle. If a 48-hour cycle is used, then there will be two times at which this condition will hold (one within the period $0 < t < t_1$, and one within $t_1 < t < t_2$; see Section 6). However, it has never been established that the plots in Figs. 5, 6 and 8 extrapolate to these points. This is a matter which should be investigated using data generated by more elaborate simulations.

(c) The next step is to investigate the “true heat transfer coefficient”, $(k'_c)_{12}$. In the region $t_1 < t < t_2$, we can apply Eq. (9) at any chosen point. This is straightforward for the data derived by simulation because the thermal balance in the absence of the calibration pulse is known exactly. For experimental data, the relevant values can be obtained from the plots of the temperature–time and cell potential–time series such as those shown in Fig. 38, Section 6. Figure 9 gives the relevant values using the data on the $(k'_c)_{11}$ -spreadsheet, spreadsheet 1. The deviations from the known value ($(k'_c)_{12} = 0.073000 \text{ WK}^{-1}$) shown in Fig. 9 as well as the component parts of this heat transfer coefficient (the ordinates and abscissae shown in spreadsheet 1) show that the effects of errors in the estimates of $(d\Delta\theta/dt)$ are now more serious than is the case for the calculation of $(k'_c)_{11}$. This is to be expected mainly in view of the relative magnitudes of $f_1(\theta)$ and $f_2(\theta)$, Eqs. (9) and (10). However, we can see from spreadsheet 2 that we would be able to derive values of $(k'_c)_{12}$ accurate to 0.01% if measurement cycles

¹¹The little which we have seen of the NHE evaluations leads us to think that this further step was never carried out. If this is correct, then the values of C_pM used would have been in error by between 10 and 20%. This error would in turn have produced an error of – 0.04% in the “lower bound heat transfer coefficients” under the most favorable conditions of estimating this coefficient at the end of the relevant 6-hour periods.

lasting 48 hours were used. It is possible to apply averaging procedures leading to $(\overline{k'_c})_{12}$ and $(\overline{k'_c})_{12}$ for the last 6 hours of calibration periods lasting 12 hours, thereby, markedly reducing the effects of “noise” in the experimental temperature– and cell potential–time series. The benefits of this type of averaging are, indeed, foreshadowed by the accurate determination of $(k'_c)_2$, Fig. 2.

The restrictions which should be placed on the determination of the “differential true heat transfer coefficients” are also illustrated by the determination of $(k_c^{I,0})_{162}$, Fig. 10. It can be seen from this figure and/or spreadsheet 2 that the range of the extrapolation required to remove (nominally) the effects of C_pM on the derived heat transfer coefficient is much longer than for the equivalent determination of $(k_c^{I,0})_{161}$. The abscissae are still *ca* 10% of the ordinates even at the end of the region which can sensibly be used for the determination of $(k_c^{I,0})_{162}$ (say, 3 hours after the application of the calibration pulse). It follows that a 20% error in C_pM will lead to at least a 2% error in $(k_c^{I,0})_{162}$. Of course, such effects are not apparent when using data produced by simulations free of “noise” but we would predict that procedures based on making thermal balances close to $t = t_1$ will not give accurate “true heat transfer coefficients” and that we should instead rely on evaluating $(k'_c)_{12}$ (and of related coefficients) at times close to $t = t_2$. This point, which will be further illustrated in Section 6, was of key importance to the specification of the ICARUS procedures [1].

The value of $(k_c^{I,0})_{162}$ obtained from Fig. 10 is also shown on Fig. 9. Although this value agrees with those described by methods judged to be satisfactory, it should be noted that this agreement is largely due to the use of data free from all ambiguities (absence of “noise,” time dependence of the heat transfer coefficients, timing errors). The use of experimental data leads to a marked degradation of the evaluation, see Section 6. A major reason for this degradation is that the data points having the highest statistical weight are also the ones which have the lowest accuracy, Fig. 10 and spreadsheet 1. It is possible, however, that the use of statistical weighting procedures would allow satisfactory estimates of $(k_c^{I,0})_{162}$ to be made.

Figure 9 also shows the values of $(k_c^{I,0})_{152}$ and $(k_c^{I,0})_{172}$ derived from spreadsheet 1 by using Eq. (12). The form of this equation shows that the derivation of these versions of the heat transfer coefficient is, in fact, dependent on the interpretation of cooling (or heating) curves, i.e., the driving force is now the enthalpy content of the calorimeters rather than the heater calibration pulse, ΔQ (these methods were developed largely as part of a program of work on the interpretation of phenomena linked to “Heat after Death”). As would be expected, the accuracy of these estimates of the heat transfer coefficient is limited even when using data free from all ambiguities. The accuracy of estimates of $(k_c^{I,0})_{152}$ and $(k_c^{I,0})_{162}$ can never be greater than that of C_pM when using real experimental data. This accuracy is further degraded by the fact that the estimates are dependent on the derivation of $(d\Delta\theta/dt)$ in regions where the accuracy of this gradient is limited by the length of the data acquisition interval.

Although Fig. 9 shows three data points for each of these estimates of the “true heat transfer coefficient,” we would expect that only one such data point could be derived when using experimental data in view of the need to estimate $(d\Delta\theta/dt)$.

d) In this sub-section, we are also including a second set of evaluations which exactly follow the set described above, Figs. 4 through 10, except that $d\Delta\theta/dt$ has been estimated using the first order backward difference. Comparison of Figs. 11 and 4 shows that the errors in $(k'_c)_{11}$ are now markedly increased in regions where $(d\Delta\theta/dt)$ is large: as expected, the errors in $(d\Delta\theta/dt)$ based on the first order differences are much larger than those based on the second order differences. Nevertheless, satisfactory values of $(k'_c)_{11}$ can be obtained provided measurement cycles of 48-hour durations are used.

Figure 11 also includes values of $(k'_c)^0_{151}$, $(k'_c)^0_{161}$, $(k'_c)^0_{171}$ and $(k'_c)^0_{181}$ determined by using the relevant extrapolations, Fig. 12 through 15. It can be seen that these values of the heat transfer coefficient can again be estimated satisfactorily. However, the slopes of the regression lines are markedly reduced (due to the incorrect estimation of $(d\Delta\theta/dt)$) so that the values of C_pM are now also too low. Of course, application of this methodology to “real experimental data” would then lead to erroneous estimates of $(k'_c)_{11}$. Figure 16 gives the plot of $(k'_c)_{12}$ versus time again based on the first order backward differences while Fig. 17 illustrates the estimation of $(k'_c)^0_{162}$. Comparison of Figs. 16 and 9 shows that $(k'_c)_{12}$ is now markedly in error in the time region adjacent to t_1 : it is necessary to extend measurements to at least 7 hours in order to ensure that the errors due to the incorrect estimation of $(d\Delta\theta/dt)$ fall below 0.1% (the target specification for ICARUS-1). Of course, this situation is aggravated when using “real experimental data” in view of errors in estimation of C_pM . Figure 17 shows that satisfactory values of $(k'_c)^0_{162}$ can still be obtained when using such incorrect estimates of $(d\Delta\theta/dt)$. This would be expected because the extrapolation procedure removes the effects of C_pM . Needless to say, the value of C_pM derived is markedly in error. Comparison of Fig. 17 with spreadsheet 2 leads to a further important conclusion. We can see that satisfactory extrapolations can be obtained even though the “point-by-point” values are totally in error at short times. As has already been noted, such long extrapolations are to be avoided when evaluating experimental data.

Figure 16 also includes some values of $(k'_c)^0_{152}$ and $(k'_c)^0_{172}$ derived from spreadsheet 2. It can be seen that these values are markedly in error even when using the correct value of C_pM . However, we note that values close to 0.073000 WK^{-1} (the value in the simulation) would be obtained if the incorrect estimate of the water equivalent (318.1 JK^{-1}) derived in Fig. 17 were used to calculate the “point-by-point” values of $(k'_c)^0_{152}$ and $(k'_c)^0_{172}$. It follows that the estimates of C_pM and of $(k'_c)^0_{152}$, $(k'_c)^0_{162}$ and $(k'_c)^0_{172}$ are internally consistent even though the component parts deviate from the true values. The procedures used to calculate these values of the “true heat transfer coefficients” must therefore be used with due care – in fact it is best to avoid such methodologies.

(e) We will consider next the derivation of the various versions of the integral heat transfer coefficients. The $(k_c^{I,0})_{21}$ spreadsheet, spreadsheet 3, gives the integrals required for the evaluation of $(k_c^I)_{21}$ and $(k_c^I)_{31}$ and Fig. 13 gives the plots of these two heat transfer coefficients against the time. It can be seen that except for small deviations of $(k_c^I)_{31}$ from the value 0.073000 WK^{-1} used in the calculation of the “raw data,” the two estimates of the heat transfer coefficient agree with this value. The reason for the small deviations of $(k_c^I)_{21}$ at short times are immediately evident. The term

$$C_p M(\theta - \theta_0) / \int_{t_2}^t f(\theta) d\tau$$

is negligibly small for the estimation of $(k_c^I)_{21}$ because $(\theta - \theta_0)$ is itself small for the backward integration. On the other hand, the term

$$C_p M(\theta - \theta_0) / \int_{t_1}^t f(\theta) d\tau$$

is initially more than 10% of $(k_c^I)_{31}$ for the forward integration procedure. The deficiencies of using the trapezium rule coupled to the use of an inadequately long data acquisition interval are therefore immediately apparent. It should be noted that the plots of $(k_c^I)_{21}$ and $(k_c^I)_{31}$ versus time do not show any effect due to the discontinuities at $t = t_1$ and $t = t_2$, provided the integral of the enthalpy input has been correctly estimated at these points. The reason for this suppression of the effects of the discontinuities is simply that the magnitudes of the integrals are now sufficiently large so that errors due to the use of the trapezium rule coupled to the use of an inadequate long measurement interval are no longer detectable.

These effects (and noneffects!) due to errors in the estimation of the integrals were of key importance to the evolution of the ICARUS-1 data processing strategy in particular the preference for the methods leading to $(k_c^{I,0})_{2,j,2}$ rather than for $(k_c^{I,0})_{3,j,2}$.

Figure 19 and spreadsheet 4 give comparisons of $(k_c^I)_{21}$ and $(k_c^I)_{22}$. It can be seen that the evaluation of the “true heat transfer coefficient, $(k_c^I)_{22}$, is satisfactory under all conditions. This is also brought out very clearly by considering the extrapolation procedures, Figs. 20 and 21. In particular, in the estimation of $(k_c^{I,0})_{262}$, the term

$$C_p M(\theta - \theta_0) / \int_{t_2}^t f_2(\theta) d\tau$$

never exceeds 10% of the term

$$\int_{t_2}^t \Delta H d\tau / \int_{t_2}^t f_2(\theta) d\tau.$$

The situation is radically different for the evaluation of $(k_c^{I,0})_{362}$, spreadsheet 5. While the extrapolation procedure for obtaining $(k_c^{I,0})_{361}$, Fig 22, is still reasonably satisfactory, provided the points immediately adjacent to t_1 are excluded (the abscissae never

exceed 15% of the ordinates, spreadsheet 5), that for $(k_c^{I,0})_{362}$, Fig. 23, is unsatisfactory because the range of the extrapolation required is very long (note the magnitudes of the ordinates and abscissae in spreadsheet 5 and the fact that the abscissae are almost equal to the ordinates at short times). Such evaluations will also be markedly degraded by the “noise” of real experimental data. Furthermore, even the borderline fits obtained must be to some extent fortuitous because the replacement of integrations using the trapezium rule by the mathematically sound mid-point rule, Figs. 24 and especially Fig. 25, gives less satisfactory results than those obtained in Fig. 23. (Note especially the erroneous values of C_pM .)

The conflicting effects of changes in the integration methods and data acquisition interval have never yet been resolved. In view of this situation, it was recommended in the Handbook for the ICARUS-1 system [1] that $(k_c^I)_{32}$ be evaluated at times close to t_2 where the effects of the term

$$C_pM(\theta - \theta_0) / \int_{t_1}^t f_2(\theta) d\tau$$

on the overall value of $(k_c^I)_{32}$ are reduced. However, following the receipt of the first set of data from the NHE Laboratory [11], it became clear that the Group would never achieve satisfactory evaluations of this version of the “true heat transfer coefficient.” As $(k_c^{I,0})_{262}$ could be evaluated satisfactorily under all conditions, it was recommended that future evaluations should be based on this version of the “true heat transfer coefficient.”

This recommendation was also influenced by a consideration of the effects of timing errors. As has already been explained, the times of application and cessation of the heater calibration pulses did not coincide exactly with the data acquisition points in the pre-ICARUS phase of the investigation. Furthermore, there were evident timing errors in the ICARUS-1 systems. These timing errors did not affect the determination of $(k_c^{I,0})_{262}$ as the times of the data acquisition points were known exactly. Nevertheless we investigated the effects of gross errors in the estimation of $\int \Delta H d\tau$ on the evaluation of $(k_c^{I,0})_{261}$ and $(k_c^{I,0})_{262}$. See Figs. 26 through 29 and spreadsheet 4. It can be seen that such gross errors lead to a maximum error of 0.5% in $(k_c^{I,0})_{262}$.

Such evaluations are therefore reasonably satisfactory. On the other hand, evaluations of $(k_c^{I,0})_{361}$ and $(k_c^{I,0})_{362}$ fail almost completely. Thus, Figs. 30 and 31 (spreadsheets 5) show that erroneous values of both the “lower bound heat transfer coefficients” and of the water equivalent are obtained if there are errors in $\int \Delta H d\tau$. Nevertheless, the values of $(k_c^I)_{31}$ at long times are still within the acceptable range as specified in the ICARUS-1 Handbook [1]. The extrapolations required for $(k_c^{I,0})_{362}$ fail completely (and the estimates of C_pM vary widely) as shown by Figs. 32 through 37. Examination of the sets Figs. 32 through 34 and Figs. 35 through 37 shows that the values of $(k_c^{I,0})_{362}$ and C_pM deduced depend on the range of the regression lines fitted. This is just the sort of behavior which was detected in the limited information available about the experiments carried out by NHE. We believe therefore that the malfunctions which

they have reported are in large measure due to the combination of estimating the “true heat transfer coefficients” by using $(k_R^{t,0})_{362}$ without any correction of the effects due to timing errors.

SECTION 6: EVALUATION OF A MEASUREMENT CYCLE FOR A “BLANK EXPERIMENT” (Pt cathode polarized in 0.1M LiOD/D₂O) USING AN ICARUS-2 SYSTEM.

It has been explained elsewhere the reasons why we have very few data sets collected with the ICARUS-1 and -2 systems. However, some of the “raw data” for parts of a “blank experiment” carried out during the summer of 1995 using an ICARUS-2 system installed at IMRA Europe are available. This experiment used a Pt cathode polarized in 0.1 M LiOD/D₂O in an ICARUS-2 cell (having an extended length of silvering in the upper portion of the cell). This measurement cycle belongs to one set of calibrations of the ICARUS-2 systems carried out at that time. Unfortunately, these calibrations were terminated in 1995 and most of the data collected at that time are no longer available.

This data set can be regarded as being satisfactory except in one regard. At that time, the cells had been wired to the “switching boxes” using thin wire. This was to be replaced by thick wire, but, unfortunately, the wiring of the calibration heaters was not changed. The power delivered to these heaters therefore has to be corrected for voltage losses external to the cell. This correction is *ca* 2% of the nominal power delivered to the cell and can be made to better than 0.1% of the 2% level. The possible error in the calibration power is therefore well below the target value for obtaining the “true heat transfer coefficients” with errors below 0.1%. The power delivered to the calibration heater was 0.23025W and the cell current was 0.20306A.

(a) We again start by plotting the “raw data,” this time of the cell temperature and cell potential versus time, Fig. 38, and by constructing the relevant $(k'_R)_{11}$ spreadsheet, spreadsheet 6. Here, we have used the third measurement cycle so as to be consistent with later evaluations (to follow). It can be seen that such measurements for “blank systems” do not show any anomalies. In particular, the initial temperature perturbation due to the refilling of the cell (to make up for the losses of D₂O due to electrolysis) relaxes within, say, 7 hours; in view of the much larger amplitude of the temperature

perturbation due to the application and cessation of the heater calibration pulse, we need to allow at least 8.5 hours to “eye-ball” the relaxations in the regions $t_1 < t < t_2$ and $t_2 < t < T$. One reason for the specification of the 48-hour long measurement cycles will be apparent immediately; such measurement cycles allow us to make the durations of $t_1 - t_0$ and $t_2 - t_1$ equal to 12 hours.

It will also be evident that the temperature following the cessation of the calibration pulse relaxes to the sloping base line. Furthermore, it will be clear that the system normally shows “negative feedback” in that increases of the cell temperature lead to a lowering of the enthalpy input (and vice versa). Tests of this “negative feedback” will be discussed in later sections.¹²

If we accept data sets such as those in Fig. 38 as being “reasonably normal,” we can evaluate the “lower bound” and “true heat transfer coefficients” at a time close to t_2 by using the graphical methods. We obtain

$$(k'_R)_{11} = 0.61844 \times 10^{-9} \text{WK}^{-4} \text{ with } E_{th,b} = 1.54\text{V} \quad (54)$$

$$(k'_R)_{11} = 0.62006 \times 10^{-9} \text{WK}^{-4} \text{ with } E_{th,b} = 1.527\text{V} \quad (55)$$

$$(k'_R)_2 = 0.62027 \times 10^{-9} \text{WK}^{-4}. \quad (56)$$

The close agreement of Eqs. (54) and (56) is almost certainly fortuitous because we expect the errors in $(k'_R)_2$ to be $ca \pm 0.002 \times 10^{-9} \text{WK}^{-4}$. If we accept the values given by Eqs. (55) and (56), then we deduce a rate of excess enthalpy generation of 0.00034W, a value which is comparable to those which we had observed previously for “blank experiments” [5, 6, 8]. As was noted previously, such low values are below those expected for the reduction of electrogenerated oxygen present in the solution. This can be explained by the degassing of the solution adjacent to the cathode by the electrogenerated deuterium.

In this preliminary assessment, we also prepare plots on an expanded scale of the temperature–time data in the regions adjacent to t_1 and t_2 , Fig. 39 (compare Fig. 3). We can see that the times of application and cessation of the calibration pulse are adequately synchronized with the data acquisition points (although such extrapolations for “real” experimental data are inevitably less certain than those for simulation, Fig. 3). It follows that it is sufficient to insert single additional points at t_1 and t_2 in the preparation of the $(k'_R)_{21}$ -spreadsheet.

¹²As we have always explained, it is essential to produce such graphs of the raw data in order to check on the normality (or otherwise) of the experiments. The data shown in Fig. 38 are “reasonably normal,” i.e., we can judge them as being suitable for further evaluation although it was apparent that the “noise levels” had increased compared to the data sets which had been collected in Salt Lake City and, subsequently, in the “old part” of the IMRA, Europe Building in Sophia Antipolis. This increase in the “noise levels” caused some degradation in the evaluations compared to those which we could achieve previously up to the end of 1992. This was already apparent in 1994 at which time we tried to find the causes for the increases in “noise.” Unfortunately, the attempts to do so were stopped.

The evaluation of $(k'_R)_{11}$ (at a point close to $t = t_2$) and of $(k'_R)_2$ is important for the evolution of the research program as well as for the assessment of the validity of other methods of data evaluation. We note in the first place that these “lower bound” and “true heat transfer coefficients” are, respectively, the least precise and least accurate values which can be obtained from the experimental data. Any conclusion that the precisions and accuracies of other methods of data evaluation are lower than this (as determined by repeated calibrations for “blank experiments”) show that either the experiments have been carried out incorrectly or that the methods of data evaluation are invalid. We note, secondly, that the Second Law of Thermodynamics requires that $(k'_R)_2 > (k'_R)_{11}$ (at the same point in time). Any conclusion that $(k'_R)_{11} > (k'_R)_2$ can only be explained by either errors in the execution of the experiments or the presence of variable sources of excess enthalpy. If the latter statement is true, it is then impossible to calibrate any conceivable calorimetric system and, in that eventuality, we need to rely on separate calibrations of the calorimeters.

(b) We next carry out a detailed examination of the $(k'_R)_{11}$ spreadsheet, spreadsheet 6. We first of all prepare a plot of $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$ versus time, Fig. 40 (compare Fig. 4) on which we also show the derived values of $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$. The error bars show $\pm\sigma$ of $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$. The “lower bound heat transfer coefficient” shows the expected linear decrease with time and the relevant regression line is drawn on the plot.

We also examine the extrapolations required to obtain $(k'^0_R)_{151}$, $(k'^0_R)_{161}$, $(k'^0_R)_{171}$, and $(k'^0_R)_{181}$, Figs. 41 - 44 (compare Figs. 5 - 8, Section 6). Of these plots, Figs. 41 and 42 are probably soundly based in that the origin of the abscissae (where $d\Delta\theta/dt = 0$) can be defined on Fig. 38. The origin for Fig. 43 cannot be defined and this puts the mathematical validity of Fig. 44 in doubt as this requires a combination of the data used in Figs. 42 and 43. Here, we have said “probably soundly based” because the question of the origins for plots of this kind needs further investigation using appropriate simulations. Notwithstanding our reservations about the validity of Fig. 44, we regard this plot as the best way of estimating the “lower bound heat transfer coefficients” and the water equivalent of the cells in the vicinity of t_2 . The water equivalent can also be estimated from a similar plot for $(k'^0_R)_{281}$, see Fig. 55 below, and the compromise value of 330 JK^{-1} has been used to derive the $(k'_R)_{11}$ spreadsheet, spreadsheet 8. This spreadsheet is actually the first iteration in the calculation scheme.¹³

In view of the scatter of the points in Fig. 40, the values of $(k'^0_R)_{151}$, $(k'^0_R)_{161}$, $(k'^0_R)_{171}$ and $(k'^0_R)_{181}$ have not been added to this plot (contrast the plot of $(k'_c)_{11}$ versus time, Fig. 4) but are given on a separate plot, Fig. 45, with respect to the regression line in Fig. 40. Figure 45 also includes the value of $(k'_R)_{11}$ derived by the graphical method, Fig. 38.

¹³As has already been noted in Section 6, we do not believe that this iteration has been carried out in the evaluations of the NHE data sets.

(c) In the next step, we evaluate $(k'_R)_{12}$ and $(\overline{k'_R})_{12}$ and plot these “true heat transfer coefficients” versus time in Fig. 46. In carrying out this evaluation, we estimate the values of E_c and θ at any given time within $t_1 < t < t_2$ by fitting regression lines through the data shown in Fig. 38 but excluding the region $t_1 < t < t_2$ and those plots where the temperature and cell potential relax following perturbations. It will be evident that the scatter of the values of $(\overline{k'_R})_{12}$ in Fig. 46 is much larger than that for $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$ shown in Fig. 40 (the regression line for $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$ is also shown in Fig. 46).

Figure 47 gives the evaluation for $(k'^0_R)_{162}$ and Fig. 48 shows values of $(k'^0_R)_{152}$, $(k'^0_R)_{162}$, $(k'^0_R)_{172}$ and $(k'_R)_2$ again with respect to the regression line for the variation of $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$ with time, Fig. 40. The increased scatter compared to the data in Fig. 45 will again be apparent. We conclude therefore that the evaluation of the “differential true heat transfer coefficients” will not be useful for calculating the rates of excess enthalpy generation. However, this does not mean that we cannot evaluate the differential rates – if we should wish to do so. The way in which we can circumvent the errors introduced by the determination of the “differential true heat transfer coefficients” is discussed in subsection of Section 6 (f) below.

(d) We will not describe/discuss the use of the first order backward difference in the evaluation of $(d\Delta\theta/dt)$ when considering the analysis of experimental data.

(e) We will consider next the derivation of the various versions of the integral heat transfer coefficients. The $(k'_R)_{21}$ -spreadsheet, spreadsheet 7, gives the integrals required for the evaluation of $(k'_R)_{21}$ and $(k'_R)_{31}$ and Fig. 49 gives the plots of these coefficients versus time. Figure 50 gives a comparison of $(k'_R)_{21}$ with $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$ and it can be seen that the use of the integral procedure leads to a marked reduction of the errors due to the differentiation of “noisy” experimental data (which is required for the evaluation of $(k'_R)_{11}$ and the derived $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$). Inevitably, the values of $(k'_R)_{21}$ and $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$ converge at long times where the definitions of the integral and differential heat transfer coefficients are equivalent. Equally the value of $(k'_R)_{31}$ at short times (as given by the regression line through the points at long times) converges onto the value of $(\overline{k'_R})_{11}$ at short times as these values are again equivalent, Fig. 49.

It can be seen from Figs. 49 and 50 that the values of $(k'_R)_{21}$ at long times deviate somewhat from the regression line. The reason for these deviations is that it is necessary to carry out *ca* 100 integration steps in order to suppress the random errors in $f_1(\theta)$ and the enthalpy input. Of course, the integration procedure still leaves us with the random errors in $[\theta(t) - \theta_0]$. However, it can be seen from Figs. 49 and 50 that the further averaging to give $(\overline{k'_R})_{21}$ has a negligible effect on the errors of this heat transfer coefficient.

It can also be seen from Fig. 49 that the deviations of $(k'_R)_{31}$ at short times from the

relevant regression line are much larger than those of $(k'_R)_{21}$ at long times. The major reason for this effect is that the use of the trapezium rule (coupled to a rather long measurement interval) introduces appreciable errors into the integration of $f_1(\theta)$ and the enthalpy input in regions where these two variables are changing rapidly with time. By contrast, the integrations required for $(k'_R)_{21}$ take place in an initial region where $f_1(\theta)$ and the enthalpy input are nearly constant with time. The curvatures of these variables with time at short times then have negligible effects on the integrals and the trapezium rule is perfectly adequate for the numerical integrations. This was the major reason for our preference for the use of $(k'_R)_{21}$ as compared to $(k'_R)_{31}$. There are, however, secondary reasons for this preference. These include the fact that $[\theta(t) - \theta_0]$ is appreciable for the initial region of the estimation of $(k'_R)_{31}$ whereas it is negligibly small for the evaluation of $(k'_R)_{21}$. Furthermore, the term

$$C_p M(\theta - \theta_0) \int f_1(\theta) dt$$

remains appreciable throughout the range of the evaluation (so that the values of $(k'_R)_{31}$ are subject to errors in $C_p M$) whereas one can find regions where

$$C_p M(\theta - \theta_0) \int f_1(\theta) dt$$

is zero (so that the values of $(k'_R)_{21}$ at these times are independent of $C_p M$).

It can be seen from Figs. 49 and 50 that the slope of the regression line for the variation of $(k'_R)_{11}$ with time is roughly twice that for the variations of $(k'_R)_{21}$ or $(k'_R)_{31}$ with time. This is to be expected. The time dependence of the heat transfer coefficients, Eq. (21), does not need to be taken into account when evaluating the differential version; it is then the variation of $(k'_R)_{11}$ with time which reveals this time dependence. This is just the term γt in Eq. (21) and we see that we can obtain a “good” value of γ from the slope of the regression line, Fig. 40. In the evaluations of $(k'_R)_{21}$ and $(k'_R)_{31}$ using Eqs. (13) and (14) we have usually defined $f_1(\theta)$ using Eq. (4) whereas our experience with the evaluations of $(k'_R)_{11}$ teaches us that we should use the definition Eq. (21). Integration of this equation gives

$$(k'_R)^0 \left[\int f_1(\theta) d\tau - \gamma t \int f_1(\theta) d\tau + \gamma \int \int f_1(\theta) d\tau d\tau \right]. \quad (57)$$

If we now regard $f_1(\theta)$ as being constant throughout the measurement cycle (which is a rough approximation for the case of the “lower bound heat transfer coefficients”), then the integral becomes

$$(k'_R)^0 f_1(\theta) t \left[1 - \frac{\gamma t}{2} \right]. \quad (58)$$

It follows that the heat transfer coefficients given by Eqs. (13) and (14) are given by

$$(k'_R)_{21} = (k'_R)^0 \left[1 + \frac{\gamma(T-t)}{2} \right] \quad (59)$$

and

$$(k'_R)_{31} = (k_R^{I,0})_{31} \left[1 - \frac{\gamma t}{2} \right] \quad (60)$$

within the limits of this approximation. $(k_R^{I,0})_{21}$ and $(k_R^{I,0})_{31}$ are respectively the values of $(k'_R)_{21}$ at $t = T$ and of $(k'_R)_{31}$ at $t = 0$. It follows that the slopes of the plots of $(k'_R)_{21}$ and $(k'_R)_{31}$ versus time are one half of the plot of $(k'_R)_{11}$ versus time.

Equation (57) also shows the way in which we can test whether the characteristics of the Dewar cells can be described by a single, time-independent heat transfer coefficient. Thus, evaluation of $(k'_R)_{21}$ according to Eq. (13) gives us the heat transfer coefficient

$$(k'_R)_{21} = (k_R^{I,0})_{21} \left[1 - \gamma + \gamma \int_T^t \int_T^t f_1(\theta) d\tau d\tau \right] / \int_T^t f_1(\theta) d\tau \quad (61)$$

so that the “time-independent” heat transfer coefficient $(k_R^{I,0})_{21}$ is readily determined. Figure 51 shows this derived coefficient versus the measurement interval. We can see that if we exclude the region adjacent to T (where the methodology is unreliable) the values of $(k_R^{I,0})_{21}$ are within $\pm 0.01\%$ of the mean of $(k_R^{I,0})_{21}$ (the relative standard deviation is 0.0063%). This is the basis of our statement that the “integral lower bound heat transfer coefficient” can be determined with a precision given by a relative error of less than 0.01%. We note that the errors in $(k_R^{I,0})_{21}$ shown in Fig. 51 are somewhat larger than those which we observed in the earlier work.

The success in deriving an unique value of $(k_R^{I,0})_{21}$ brings in its train two further aspects. First of all, we need to assess the likely errors of the “point-by-point” values of $(k'_R)_{21}$ and $(k'_R)_{31}$. Examination of spreadsheet 10 shows that the “minor term”

$$C_p M (\theta - \theta_0) / \int_T^t f_1(\theta) d\tau$$

is maximally $ca \pm 1.4\%$ of the derived values of $(k'_R)_{21}$ (at the points $t = 0$ and $t = t_2$). On the other hand, this “minor term” rises to $ca 25\%$ of $(k'_R)_{31}$ within the calibration period $t_1 < t < t_2$ and is $ca 7\%$ of $(k'_R)_{31}$ at $t = 0$. Evidently, the heat transfer coefficients based on the backward integration procedure are to be preferred to those based on forward integration. Secondly, we see that the preferred procedure would be to use extrapolation procedures to remove the effects of the water equivalent, which is the parameter subject to the greatest uncertainties.

Figures 52 through 55 show such extrapolation procedures for deriving $(k_R^{I,0})_{251}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{261}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{271}$, and $(k_R^{I,0})_{281}$, as well as the corresponding values of $C_p M$. The extrapolation in Fig. 52 will be to a point in the range $0 < t < t_1$ where the temperature is equal to that at the end of the measurement cycle (roughly at 6900s). As can be seen the values of $(k'_R)_{21}$ and $(k_R^{I,0})_{251}$ show that this is indeed so. The extrapolations in Figs. 53 through 55 should all be to the end of the measurement cycle at $t = T$. However, the values of $(k_R^{I,0})_{261}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{271}$ and $(k_R^{I,0})_{281}$ are somewhat larger than that of $(k'_R)_{21}$ at that point

(given the value read off from the regression line). In 1992/93, we concluded that this was due to the range of the extrapolation required being too long. In order to avoid this difficulty, we restricted the integrations to $t_1 < t < t_2$ and set the origin of the abscissa at a time close to $t = t_2$. The extrapolation, Fig. 62, will now be to the value of $(k'_R)_{11}$ at this point and this is again the case (see also spreadsheet 8).

Figure 60 gives the “point-by-point” values of $(k'_R)_{21}$ for the time range $t_1 < t < t_2$ and these are somewhat below the variation predicted based on the assumption in Eq. (59). We note that it has never been resolved whether the small discrepancies observed are due to using this assumption rather than Eq. (61) (however, they are at least due in part to the use of Eq. (59) rather than (61)). Instead, we have recommended the use of the extrapolation procedure shown in Fig. 62. In attempting to interpret the variation of (k'_R) with time shown in Fig. 60, it should also be born in mind that the values of this heat transfer coefficient are unreliable for about the first 110 integration intervals adjacent to $t = t_2$.

Figure 60 also gives the corresponding data for $(k'_R)_{32}$ while Fig. 63 shows that the extrapolation procedure required for deriving $(k'^0_R)_{361}$ is unreliable, even if the first 11 data points are excluded from the extrapolation. The main reason for this lack of reliability lies in the large values of the abscissae, which reach *ca* 30% of the value of $(k'_R)_{31}$. (However, note that the extrapolations based on the integrals spanning the whole of the measurement cycle $0 < t < T$, Figs. 56 through 59, are somewhat more satisfactory; the procedure for deriving $(k'^0_R)_{361}$, Fig. 57, is reasonably sound). It was for this reason that this procedure was excluded in the Handbook for the ICARUS-1 systems [1]. We also see that the estimate of $(k'_R)_{31}$ at times close to t_2 is somewhat lower than that predicted from Eq. (60). However, reference to spreadsheet 8 shows that the abscissae are still *ca* 2.3% of the ordinates for the evaluation of $(k'_R)_{31}$ at this point (for the 24-hour measurement cycles used in the NHE investigations this ratio rises to *ca* 4.4%). A 3% error in C_pM would therefore account for such discrepancies!

Figure 61 gives the values of the “true heat transfer coefficients” $(k'_R)_{22}$ and $(k'_R)_{32}$ over the restricted range $t_1 < t < t_2$ while Figs. 64 and 65 give the evaluations of $(k'^0_R)_{262}$ and $(k'^0_R)_{362}$. It can be seen that $(k'^0_R)_{262}$ is close to the value of $(k'_R)_{11}$ at $t = t_2$ as given by the relevant regression line. On the other hand, $(k'^0_R)_{362}$ deviates markedly from the value of $(k'_R)_{11}$ at $t = 0$, even if we once again exclude the first 11 points from the extrapolation. Spreadsheet 9 shows that the nominally “minor term” now reaches *ca* 100% of the value of the “major term” while the “minor term” is *ca* 2900% of $(k'_R)_{32}$. It goes without saying that it is not possible to evaluate $(k'_R)_{32}$ with this particular methodology. It was for this reason that the ICARUS-1 Handbook recommended that $(k'_R)_{32}$ should be evaluated “point-by-point” at times close to $t = t_2$. Spreadsheet 9 shows that the “minor term” in the evaluation of $(k'_R)_{32}$ is still *ca* 12% of the major term while for a 24-hour measurement cycle it would reach *ca* 25% of the major term. The accurate determination of $(k'_R)_{32}$ is therefore fraught with difficulties. These conclusions should

be compared with those presented in the poster given at ICCF 7 [4].

Finally, Fig. 66 illustrates the determination of $(k'_R)^0_{252}$, i.e., of the “true heat transfer coefficient” without making use of the calibration pulse. Whereas the determination of the differential coefficient $(k'_R)^0_{152}$ fails (because of the inevitably large errors introduced by the differentiation of “noisy” experimental data), the determination of $(k'_R)^0_{252}$ is reasonably successful. The evaluation of this version of the “true heat transfer coefficient” can therefore serve as a useful check on some of the more extreme statements which have been made about the validity of the ICARUS-1 evaluation procedures.

(f) We come now to the principal conclusions which we can draw from the detailed examination of “blank” experiments, taken in conjunction with the analysis of data generated by simulations, Section 5. The optimal methodology for the evaluation of the “lower bound heat transfer coefficient” is that based on the backward integration leading to $(k'_R)^0_{21}$, although that based on the forward integration leading to $(k'_R)^0_{31}$ can also be used. Furthermore, the differential form, $(k'_R)^0_{11}$, is also useful.

However, the only accurate method for the evaluation of the “true heat transfer coefficient” is that based on the backward integrals and, especially, the extrapolation procedure giving $(k'_R)^0_{262}$, which was the methodology specified for the ICARUS-1 systems [1]. It is therefore sensible to combine such values of $(k'_R)^0_{262}$ with the corresponding values of $(k'_R)^0_{261}$. For the data set discussed here, we obtain from Figs. 60 and 61 (or Figs. 53 and 64, spreadsheets 8 and 9):

$$\Delta(k'_R) = (k'_R)^0_{262} - (k'_R)^0_{261} = 0.00043 \times 10^{-9} \text{WK}^{-4}. \quad (62)$$

This value is to be preferred to

$$\Delta(k'_R) = (k'_R)^0_{2} - (k'_R)^0_{11} = 0.00021 \times 10^{-9} \text{WK}^{-4}, \quad (63)$$

given by the graphical methods (Eu. (55)).

It should be noted that both of these methods give values of the heat transfer coefficients close to the mid-point of the measurement cycles (which was one reason for the specification of the time $t = t_2$). Furthermore, the difference in Eq. (62) is actually equal to

$$\Delta(k'_R) = (k'_R)^0_{12} - (k'_R)^0_{11} \quad (64)$$

at this point. This is of no particular consequence as far as the evaluation of the total excess enthalpy for the measurement cycle is concerned because the difference in Eq.(62) applies to any part of the cycle at the first level of approximation. It follows that

$$\text{Total excess enthalpy} = \Delta(k'_R) \int_T^0 f_1(\theta) d\tau. \quad (65)$$

For the particular example used in the present illustration, we obtain

$$\text{Total excess enthalpy} = 102\text{J}, \quad (66)$$

corresponding to a mean excess rate of 0.0006 W.

However, we note that the group at NHE have attempted to calculate the variation of the rate of excess enthalpy generation throughout the measurement cycles. At first sight, it would appear that we need to use the correct time-dependent values of $(k'_R)_{12}$, i.e., $[k'_R(t)]_{12}$. At the time of writing of the Handbook for the ICARUS-1 systems [1], it was not clear how this variation was to be established. It became clear subsequently that if the difference between the “true” and “lower bound heat transfer coefficients” could be established at any one time (say $\Delta(k'_R)_t$), then $[k'_R(t)]_{12}$ at any other time would be given by

$$[k'_R(t)]_{12} = [k'_R(t)]_{11} + \Delta(k'_R)_{t_2} f_1(\theta)_{t_2} / f_1(\theta)_t. \quad (67)$$

The ratio $f_1(\theta)_{t_2} / f_1(\theta)_t$ is of order unity, which implies that the correction term is always close to that at the calibration point.

Any attempt to calculate the variation of rates of excess enthalpy generation within the measurement cycles must also pay due regard to the fact that it is not possible to calibrate the systems if the rate of excess enthalpy generation varies with time. If that is the case, then we must derive $\Delta(k'_R)$ from separate experiments.

Equation (67) also points to a further important conclusion. Again at the time of writing of the Handbook for the ICARUS-1 systems [1], we believed that the precision of $(k'_R)_{12}$ (and of other versions of the “true heat transfer coefficient”) would always be given by the accuracy of that coefficient which is certainly lower than the precision of $(k'_R)_{11}$. Equation (67) shows that this is incorrect. The precision of $(k'_R)_{12}$ is nearly identical to the precision of $(k'_R)_{11}$. It follows that changes in the rates of excess enthalpy generation can be established at the same level of precision as that of $(k'_R)_{11}$, i.e., with relative errors *ca* 0.01%.

SECTION 7: ASSESSMENT OF THE SPECIFICATION OF THE ICARUS-1 EXPERIMENTAL PROTOCOLS AND DATA EVALUATION PROCEDURES.

The specification of the ICARUS-1 experimental protocols and data evaluation procedures has been outlined in Section 4. It is now important to assess the usefulness and validity of this specification in the light of its application to data generated by simulations (see Section 5) and by “blank” experiments (see Section 6). Of course, this procedure is “back-to-front”: the specification, Section 4, was evolved from a consideration of the type of results outlined in Sections 5 and 6.

It is also important to consider the “raison-d’être” of this part of the research program and some comments on this are given at the end of this section. Furthermore, it is important to consider the causes of failures to achieve evaluations especially in the light of the well publicized publication from the group at NHE [5]. Finally, it is necessary to consider “short-cuts” to achieving satisfactory data evaluations.

In our view, the major results derived from Section 6 (backed up by the investigation in Section 5) are the comparisons of $(k'_R)_{21}$ and $(k'_R)_{11}$ in Fig. 50 and the reduction of $(k'_R)_{21}$ to a single, time-independent, lower bound heat transfer coefficient, Fig. 51. The comparison, Fig. 50, illustrates immediately the need to avoid the differentiation of “noisy” experimental data (required for the evaluation of $(k'_R)_{11}$ and the benefits of using instead the integration procedures in deriving $(k'_R)_{21}$); however, see further below. This was the basis for the specification of the construction of the $(k'_R)_{21}$ spreadsheets following on the construction of the $(k'_R)_{11}$ spreadsheets (see (vi) and (vii) of Section 4).

Results such as those illustrated in Fig. 50 show that it is possible to interpret the systematic variations with time of *ca* 0.4% of the “integral lower bound heat transfer coefficient” while Fig. 51 shows that it is possible to reduce such data to a single, time-independent, heat transfer coefficient, $(k_R^{l,0})_{21}$ with relative errors below 0.01%. This

result is hardly surprising. The “physics” of the calorimeters are quite simple (they are “ideal well stirred tanks”) and the errors are mainly due to those set by the temperature measurements. It is also relatively straightforward to specify the changes which would need to be made to reduce the errors – say, to 0.001% – if that should ever prove to be necessary or desirable.

The comparison of $(k'_R)_{21}$ with $(k'_R)_{31}$ in Fig. 50 as well as in spreadsheet 7 shows that the errors in $(k'_R)_{31}$ are inevitably larger than those of $(k'_R)_{21}$. This is mainly due to the larger contribution of the term

$$C_p M(\theta - \theta_0) / \int_0^t f_1(\theta) d\tau$$

to $(k'_R)_{31}$ rather than the corresponding contribution of

$$C_p M(\theta - \theta_0) / \int_T^t f_1(\theta) d\tau$$

to $(k'_R)_{21}$. We can see immediately, that given the option of using forward or backward integration we should use the latter in order to achieve accurate evaluations. This restriction becomes much more important, however, when we consider the derivation of the “true heat transfer coefficients,” $(k'_R)_{22}$ and $(k'_R)_{32}$, as well as of the likely effects of timing errors on the evaluations. Such evaluations must necessarily be mainly restricted to the duration of the calibration pulse, $t_1 < t < t_2$. Figures 60 and 61 and the associated spreadsheets 8 and 9 show that whereas an initial assessment might well be based on the use of $(k'_R)_{31}$, the evaluation and use of the “true heat transfer coefficient,” $(k'_R)_{32}$, must follow strictly the instructions laid down in the ICARUS-1 Handbook [1] (see (vii) of Section 4) – and, even then, the errors are much larger than those of $(k'_R)_{22}$.

The optimum methodology for deriving the difference between the “true” and “lower bound heat transfer coefficients,” i.e., $\Delta(k'_R)$, Eq. (62), is to estimate $(k'_R)^{l,0}_{262}$ from plots such as that in Fig. 64 and $(k'_R)^{l,0}_{261}$ from the corresponding plot in Fig. 62. Such evaluations automatically eliminate the contributions of the water equivalent on the estimates, a parameter which is subject to the greatest degree of uncertainty. The evaluation of the difference $\Delta(k'_R)$ allows us also to circumvent the errors in the evaluation of the “true differential heat transfer coefficient,” $(k'_R)_{12}$, Fig. 46, because $\Delta(k'_R)$ applies equally to $(k'_R)_{12}$ and $(k'_R)_{11}$, Eq. (64), as to $(k'_R)^{l,0}_{262}$ and $(k'_R)^{l,0}_{261}$, Eq. (62). It follows, therefore that we can evaluate rates of excess enthalpy generation at the level of accuracy determined by $\Delta(k'_R)$ and precision of $(k'_R)_{11}$. However, we cannot see why we should ever wish to do so, given that we have had to evaluate the backward integrals to determine $\Delta(k'_R)$ so that the values of the total excess enthalpy in a measurement cycle (or any given part of a measurement cycle) follow immediately as by the application of Eq. (65). If we evaluate instead the rates of excess enthalpy generation, then we must sum these rates (multiplied by the measurement interval) to obtain the total excess enthalpy [4] (more exactly, we need to apply an appropriate integration rule).

Sections 5 and 6 also illustrate the evaluations of the "time-independent" heat transfer coefficients $(k_R^{I,0})_{151}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{161}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{171}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{181}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{152}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{162}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{172}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{251}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{261}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{271}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{281}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{252}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{262}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{272}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{351}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{361}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{371}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{381}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{352}$, $(k_R^{I,0})_{362}$ and $(k_R^{I,0})_{372}$. Of these, the evaluations of $(k_R^{I,0})_{261}$ and $(k_R^{I,0})_{262}$, Figs. 62 and 64, were the methodologies specified for the ICARUS-1 system. The reduced precisions and accuracies of the series $(k_R^{I,0})_{1,j,l}$ compared to those of $(k_R^{I,0})_{2,j,l}$ will be apparent as will be the reduced precisions and accuracies of the series $(k_R^{I,0})_{3,j,l}$ compared to those of $(k_R^{I,0})_{2,j,l}$. The evaluation of $(k_R^{I,0})_{362}$, Fig. 65, is especially prone to error.¹⁴

The failure to achieve satisfactory calibrations of the cells using the procedures leading to $(k_R^I)_{362}$ in the studies by the group at NHE coupled to the evident timing errors in the ICARUS-1 system installed in Sapporo, also prompted an investigation of the likely effects of such errors if these were not properly taken into account. Figs. 26-37 show the expected results. Whereas the "target evaluations" of $(k_R^{I,0})_{261}$ and $(k_R^{I,0})_{262}$ are relatively insensitive to the effects of such errors (Figs. 26-29), the evaluations of $(k_R^{I,0})_{361}$ and $(k_R^{I,0})_{362}$ are markedly degraded (Figs. 30-37). Moreover, the values of $(k_R^{I,0})_{361}$ and $(k_R^{I,0})_{362}$ (the intercepts of the plots) now depend on the time range of the regression fit (the discussion of these effects is beyond the scope of the present report). It is evidently critically important to avoid the effects of such timing errors because there are other reasons which preclude the achievement of satisfactory calibrations most notably the effects of changes in the rates of excess enthalpy generation especially those due to "positive feedback," e.g., see [4,12]. It is essential therefore that tests of the performance of the instrumentation be carried out using "blank experiments" (see Section 4 (iii)) in order to avoid the complications introduced by the study of the Pd-D₂O system.¹⁵

Sections 5 and 6 will also have illustrated the reasons for the need to use 48-hour measurement cycles [see Section 4 (i)] as well as the benefits of examining and evaluating plots of the raw data such as that in Fig. 38 [see Section 4 (v)].

Finally, it is important to assess the usefulness of the calibration procedures described in this section as well as the preceding sections. It appears that this is a topic which has been misunderstood. It would hardly be possible to investigate all measurement cycles of all experiments at the level of detail set out in Section 6. The real purpose of developing precise and accurate methods of calibration is to gain an adequate understanding of the "instrument function" and then to use the calibration(s) to measure the rates of excess enthalpy generation. A secondary objective (related to the assessment of the calibrations) is to point the way towards necessary (or useful) improvements of

¹⁴Unfortunately, such evaluations appear to have been a major part of the investigations carried out by NHE.

¹⁵We have never been able to obtain data for the study of any such "blank systems" which may have been carried out by NHE.

the instrumentation. We note here that the original cells, which were not silvered in the top section, gave a flat temperature-time base line because changes in the heat transfer coefficient with time were compensated by changes in the enthalpy input. However, the heat transfer coefficients varied markedly with time and this complicated the methods of data analysis. The silvering in the top sections of the ICARUS-1 and -2 calorimeters has markedly reduced this time dependence of the heat transfer coefficients, but the effects (e.g., see Fig. 50) do still have to be taken into account.¹⁶ In 1990/91, it appeared important that we should investigate a further modification of the calorimeter design designated as the ICARUS-4 version in 1993 (the ICARUS-3 designs were never constructed) but redesignated since that time as ICARUS-14, vol. I, Fig. 27. We believe that this design would give a flat base line for the heat transfer coefficient-time plot and that this would also make the heat transfer coefficient insensitive to the operating conditions.

An alternative approach would be to investigate the maintenance of constant electrolyte levels as has been done in the investigations carried out by the group at Grenoble [15]. It would be important to try to secure the release of data for “blank experiments” carried out by that group.

A secondary reason for carrying out repeated calibrations is to monitor the system behavior [4, 5] especially the effects of the onset of positive feedback. However, such investigations do not need to be carried out at the high levels of precision and accuracy required for the calibration of the calorimeters.

¹⁶We note that this has not been taken into account in the work carried out by the group at NHE.

REFERENCES.

1. "The ICARUS Systems: Isoperibolic Calorimetry Research and Utilities Systems. Version 1 Low Power Measuring System for Three Cells, Technova Inc., 13th Floor, Fukoku Science Bdg., 2-2-2 Uchisaivai-cho, Chiyodas-ku, Tokyo 100, Japan
2. "Second Report on the Experiments carried out under the NEDO/NHE Project at the Sapporo Laboratories", December 1994.
3. S. Pons and M. Fleischmann, *Trans. Fusion Technology*, 26 (1994) 87.
4. M. Fleischmann, "Illustrations of Evaluations of Calorimetric Data Sets", Poster given at I.C.C.F. 7, Vancouver, Canada, April (1998).
5. M. Fleischmann and S. Pons, *Proceedings of ICCF-3* (1992) 47
6. M. Fleischmann and S. Pons, *Physics Lett. A* **176**, 118 (1993)
7. Toshiya Saito, Masao Sumi, Naoto Asami and Hideo Ikegami, *Proceedings of ICCF 5* (1995) 105.
8. M. Fleischmann, S. Pons, M.W. Anderson, L.J. Li and M. Hawkins. *J. Electroanal. Chem*, 287 (1990) 293.
9. R.H. Wilson, J.W. Bray, P.G. Kosky, H.B. Vakil and F.G. Will, *J. Electroanal. Chem*, 332 (1992) 1.
10. D.E. Williams, D.J.S. Findley, D.W. Gaston, M.R. Sene, M. Bailey, S. Croft, B.W. Hooten, C.P. Jones, A.R.J. Kucernak, J.A. Mason and R.I. Taylor, *Nature*, 392 (1989) 375.
11. "Report on the First Set of Experiments carried out under the NEDO/NFIE Project at the Sapporo Laboratories", June 1994.
12. M. Fleischmann, *Proceedings of ICCF 5*, (1995) 152.
15. G. Lonchamp, L. Bonnetain and P. Hicter, *Proceedings of I.C.C.F. 6* (1996) 113.
10. M. Fleischmann and S. Pons, *J. Electroanal. Chem*, 332 (1992) 33.

FIGURES

TABLES

Initial distribution list

Spawar Systems Center San Diego, San Diego

Dr. Frank E. Gordon, Code 03
Dr. Randall H. Moore, Code
Dr. Pamela A. Boss (10), Code
Patent Counsel, Code 0012
Library, Code

Naval Air Warfare Center, China Lake

Dr. Melvin H. Miles(10). Code 4T4220D
Dr. Robin A. Nissan, Code 4T4200D
Dr. Geoffrey A. Lindsay, Code 4T42200D
Dr. Jeffrey J. Davis, Code 4T4330D
Office of General Counsel, Patent Office, Code 772000D
Technical Library, Code 4TL000D

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington DC

Dr. Timothy Coffey, Code 1001
Dr. Bhakta Rath, Code 6000
Dr. Scott R. Chubb (10), Code 7252
Dr. Ashraf Imam, Code 6320

Office of Naval Research

Dr. Fred E. Saalfeld, Technical Director

Defense Technical Information Center

Alexandria, VA 22304-6145

Navy Acquisition, Research and Development Information Center (NARDIC)

Arlington, VA 22244-5114

Professor J. O'M. Bockris
4973 Afton Oaks Drive
College Station, TX 77845

Dr. Talbot A. Chubb
Research Systems, Inc.
5023 North 38-th Street
Arlington, VA 22207

Professor John Dash
Physics Department
Portland State University
P. O. Box 751
Portland, OR 972078-0751

Professor Peter L. Hagelstein
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Dept. of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
Room 36-225
77 Massachusetts Ave
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. Eugene Mallove
New Energy Research Laboratory
P. O. Box 2816
Concord, NH 03302-2816

Dr. Michael McKubre
SRI International
333 Ravenswood Ave
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Dr. Michael Melich
Naval Postgraduate School
1224 Meigs Drive
Niceville, FL 32578-3018

Professor George H. Miley
Fusion Studies Laboratory
University of Illinois
103 S. Goodwin Ave
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. David J. Nagel
The George Washington University
2933 K Street, Suite 340J
Washington, DC 20052

Dr. Robert J. Nowak
DARPA
3701 N. Fairfax Drive
Arlington, VA 22203

Professor Richard A. Oriani
112 Amundson Hall
University of Minnesota
421 Washington Ave SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Jerry J. Smith
U. S. Department of Energy
Code SC-13/GTN
19901 Germantown Road
Germantown, MD 20874-1290

Professor Louis D. Smullin
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. Lowell Wood
Hoover Institution HT - 1004
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-6010