

- measurement of the resistance has been made by him at the ends of the resistance.
- b- You write “a more accurate description of the procedure for the measurement of the chain consisting of the electrical cables that connect the resistance to the multimeter was necessary”: this statement is false and groundless, because your Scientific Responsible described clearly for any expert of the art the circuit and its connections of the cables. He has reported the data sheet of the resistance and of all the components.
  - c- You write: “The risk is therefore to have measured a higher resistance value than the real one”. This statement is ridiculous for two reasons: first reason is that we used a standard resistance that everybody can buy in the internet and your Scientific Responsible has got it at the end of the measurements, bringing it with him, to control eventually that it is regular. The second reason that makes ridiculous your statement is that SHOULD THE RESISTANCE HAVE BEEN LOWER THAN WHAT HAS BEEN MEASURED, THE EFFICIENCY OF THE APPARATUS WOULD HAVE BEEN HIGHER, as it is obvious for anybody who knows the Ohm’s equations:  
 $A = V/R$  and  $W = A * V$
  - d- You write “We also note that there was no measurement of the resistance at operating temperatures. Even if the resistor was immersed in a bath of 5 kg of insulating oil, the temperature rise could have increased its value from that measured at room temperature by 100 ppm/K thus decreasing the value of the measured power”: this statement is totally flawed by nonsense, because, as a matter of fact, the Scientific Responsible has verified that the temperature of oil was slightly superior to the room temperature, because the 7 kg ( and not 5 ) of dielectric oil have a high thermal capacity and the oil tank was put upon massive aluminium dissipators, so that the delta T was irrelevant to the actual value of the resistance, as any expert of the art can easily understand consulting the resistance data sheet whose link is published in the report made by the Scientific Responsible of UNIBO, under the direction of his Supervisor.
  - e- You write: “In the measurement of the input power could be present errors, since it was done in differential mode and the measured powers were small compared to the sensitivity of the instrument”: this statement is flawed by the fact that it is “apodictic”: you write that the “instrument” (its proper name is Wattmeter) had a “sensitivity” ( the proper definition is “margin of error”) too high to measure the effective current flowed to the power source. The falsity of this consideration is easy to proof, just reading the data sheet of the Wattmeter. By the way, at the end of the test, as well as we did with the resistance, we allowed the Scientific Responsible chosen by his Supervisor, to keep with him the Wattmeter, to control that it was exactly as described in the data sheet; as a consequence of this fact, your Scientific Responsible, under the control of his Supervisor, has reported the data also of the Wattmeter in the report, as well as he did with the resistance.
  - f- You write:”Therefore, the considerations reported in Section 5, which concern possible applications of the devices, are meaningless”: Actually, Section 5 does not contain measurements, but it describes a presumable projection of possible configurations, that are all but meaningless.

For all these reasons, your scientific considerations and conclusions lack rigor and have no scientific validity. Therefore, we are ready to defend our position in all sites and to request the refund of any damage caused to Leonardo Corporation by your actions.

Sincerely,

Miami Beach, February 12,2022



Dr Andrea Rossi (CEO)  
Leonardo Corporation