

Experimental Lessons in Replication of 'Low Energy Nuclear Reactions'

Mason J. Guffey¹, Mark Hoeffler¹, Graham Cross², P.J. King^{1*}

Abstract

Over the past ten years, there has been renewed interest in investigating recent claims of 'cold fusion' or 'Low Energy Nuclear Reactions' (LENR). Over a five-year research effort, our group replicated one of the most cited experiments in the field as well as performing original work using modern semiconductor methods. Although our experiments exhibited the same 'anomalous heat' phenomenon (similar in both magnitude and duration) reported in prior LENR research, we found that calorimeter instability over long duration experiments explained the results.

In a separate set of experiments, evidence of low-level nuclear products were also observed by our team and explained by insufficient screening of the detector electronics.

These subtle sources of experimental error should serve as a cautionary tale for those undertaking research work in this field.

In recent years, there have been renewed efforts including those of Berlinguette *et al.*¹, to investigate claims of 'cold fusion'. We conducted 215 experiments and 407 experimental runs of so-called 'Low Energy Nuclear Reactions' (LENR) relating to the claims of 'cold fusion' in deuterated palladium². Our experiments ran from 2012-2016 at a cost of about \$3 million.

Our experiments exhibited the same 'anomalous heat' phenomenon (similar in both magnitude and duration) reported in prior LENR research³, but we found that calorimeter instability over long duration experiments explained the results.

In a separate set of experiments, evidence of low-level nuclear products were also observed by our team and explained by insufficient screening of the detector electronics.

If LENR research is to continue, then advanced calorimeters of the kind proposed by Berlinguette *et al.* must be used. The experiments must demonstrate calorimeter stability that is at least as long as the experimental run itself. Shorter calibration runs are insufficient.

Our program contained two approaches: -

1. Testing electrochemical cell configurations claimed to show 'anomalous heat' triggered by laser excitation³— a much cited claim of the cold fusion community.

2. Original, previously unpublished work that created an electrochemical 'cell on a chip' using modern semiconductor fabrication methods, allowing for measurement of low-energy X-rays emitted from the system.

1. Laser Triggering an electrochemical cell

Hagelstein *et. al.*³ claimed an 'anomalous' heat effect of up to 300 mW in an electrochemical cell containing deuterated water and calibrated to a thermal error of 10 mW. They made a surprising claim that LENR could be triggered by the application of dual laser beams to the cathode, tuned to a specific difference frequency. We conducted a detailed replication of their 2007 research, and where possible we used the identical equipment to the original. We published the results of this replication effort in the journal that also contained the original research.⁴

An often overlooked fact in many 'cold fusion' electrochemical cell experiments are their duration: typically, researchers leave their cells running from a week to a month.⁵ It is claimed this is required to 'condition' the palladium cathodes in some unknown way, as a necessary precursor to observe the anomalous heat effect.

Thermal calibration of the electrochemical cell is done before commencement of an experimental run by ramping the current and measuring the resulting

¹ ReResearch LLC, Hawthorne, California. ² Department of Physics, Trinity College Dublin. *email: correspondence@reresearch.net

temperature increase. Stepping up the current input and plotting the energy versus temperature increase should produce a linear fit. Typically, this process is conducted over a few hours and is done both before an experimental run and intermittently during it, to re-check stability. Using this method, our apparatus had a thermal error of $<25\text{mW}$ - reasonably consistent with the prior work of Hagelstein *et al.*, which claimed a 10mW error.

Over 237 experimental trials, we observed no laser-triggered anomalous heat in our experiments. However, at intermittent periods while there was no laser triggering as well as in a concurrent control experiment, we did see thermal deviations that ranged from 135mW to 324mW in a cell that repeatedly demonstrated an error of $<25\text{mW}$ during in-situ calibration testing.

Note that these deviations were of the same order as the claimed anomalous heat observations reported in the original work by Hagelstein *et al.* The artifacts were intermittent and not readily observed in calibration tests lasting only a few hours, but were present nonetheless in an experiment that lasted 8 days.

We submit that this approach to calibration is inadequate for establishing a calorimeter's propensity for heat artifacts. Running a dynamic computational model to fit all of the data from a multi-day calibration run provides a better indication of the size of heat artifacts and the conditions where they occur.

Stability over time periods longer than the experiment should be demonstrated in order to minimize the possibility of misinterpreting the fluctuations that we observed as "excess heat" events.

Consequently, we contend that all claims of anomalous heat in LENR experiments using electrochemical cells that do not exhibit thermal stability on a time period longer than the time duration of the experiment itself must be thrown out.

As the majority of research over the past 30 years has not demonstrated this kind of calibration stability, that eliminates most of the effort in this field.

Of the remaining experiments, which claim small quantities of nuclear products as evidence of LENR, our second set of experiments also prove instructive.

2. Measurement of X-Rays from a Fleischmann-Pons cell

Researchers seeking direct, incontrovertible evidence of a LENR phenomenon have tried to observe nuclear products such as neutrons or alpha particles in their experiments⁶.

The absence of neutrons from an experiment that claims D-D fusion has been problematic and controversial in the past⁷, leading some LENR researchers to speculate that LENR does not follow a conventional nuclear pathway,⁸ while the majority of physicists have seen it as evidence that any anomalous observations are non-nuclear.⁹

If the anomalous heat was real in any of the LENR literature and if it were of nuclear origin, one would expect that, regardless of the nuclear pathway, production of secondary X-rays would be observed. However, measurement of X-rays through the apparatus typically used in LENR experiments is difficult, especially if the X-rays themselves were low-energy and thus unable to escape the apparatus.

To overcome these deficiencies, we developed specialized electrochemical cells to detect the emission of soft X-rays during electrolysis of palladium in deuterated electrolyte (Figs 1 - 4). Palladium electrodes were deposited on silicon chips in a variety of configurations and surface topologies, utilizing various vapor deposition techniques. With this system it was not possible to make calorimetric measurements, but it did allow for extremely close placement of an X-ray detector, with a detection range of ~ 1 to 40keV , at the backside of the chip (Fig 3), which were etched to allow for the escape of soft X-rays in this range, should they occur.




Fig. 1 The electrochemical cell reduced to a semiconductor chip




Fig. 2 Closeup of the chip. Pd cathode is deposited by CVD on a Si substrate.




Fig. 3 X-Ray emissions are detected from the underside of the apparatus by positioning a Moxtek detector on the underside of the chip. (shown with pink protective lens cap in-situ)




Fig. 4 The complete apparatus, with top cover allowing a reservoir for deuterated electrolyte.

We performed 170 experimental runs with this apparatus, varying a broad parameter set that included various types of light and heavy-water based electrolytes, metal ion impurities, nanomaterials, and other additives.

During a specific set of measurements, we observed a low rate of X-ray emission in the experiment, which was not found in the light-water control. This surprising result occurred with regular frequency in the experiment, but displayed a broad, low-energy emission spectrum, at the detection limit of the detector, at ~ 1 keV.

We suspended the experiment and swapped the deuterated experiment chip with the light water control, thus making the control apparatus the live test and vice versa. This was done to eliminate instrumentation error. We continued to get a weak X-ray signature from the deuterated chip, but not from the (new) light-water control.

Had we ceased our efforts there, this experiment may very well have become one of the seminal experiments in the 'cold fusion' field and would probably have garnered widespread media attention.

After weeks of effort, we finally discovered the source of the X-ray signal. Though the X-ray detector was supposedly shielded from electromagnetic interference by the manufacturer, the culprit was

interference from a cell phone carried by one of our researchers.

Why, then, did the control experiment never yield the same erroneous result? Because the field from a cell phone falls with the square of the distance, and the natural inclination of any researcher is to briefly check that the control experiment is running well, but spend most of their time checking the live experiment. That closer average proximity led to this deceptive result.

This should serve as a salutary lesson in experimental discipline, and in doing the utmost to find rudimentary causes for apparently remarkable results.

3. Is LENR a falsifiable hypothesis?

In conclusion, we contend that the achievement of the stability required to make calibration valid has not been attained in the LENR experiments we have encountered or replicated.

These findings led us to pose an essential question on LENR: can it be articulated as a falsifiable hypothesis? We contend that given the physical constraints on performing the experiment done by the LENR community to date it has not been.

To be sure, there is more to learn about the nature of nuclear reactions in a condensed matter environment. However, from our perspective, five years of effort have demonstrated that there are mundane experimental explanations for most, if not all, of the claims of LENR/cold fusion research to date.

¹ Berlinguette et al., *Nature*, 570, 45-51 (2019)

² *Electroanal. Chem.* 261, 301 (1989); M. Fleischmann, S. Pons and M. Hawkins

³ P.L. Hagelstein, D. Letts and D. Cravens, Terahertz difference frequency response of PdD in two-laser experiments, *J. Condensed Matter Nucl. Sci.* 3 (2010) 59–76.

⁴ M.Guffey, et. al., *J. Condensed Matter Nucl. Sci.* 20 (2016) 1–28

⁵ Miles, M., et al., Correlation of excess power and helium production during D2O and H2O electrolysis using palladium cathodes. *J. Electroanal. Chem.*, 1993. 346: p. 99

⁶ Mosier-Boss, P., Szpak, S., Gordon, F., & Forsley, L. (2007). Use of CR-39 in Pd/D co-deposition experiments.

The European Physical Journal - Applied Physics, 40(3), 293-303. doi:10.1051/epjap:2007152

⁷ D.E Williams et al., *Nature* volume 342, pages 375–384 (1989)

⁸ L. Hagelstein, Peter & Mckubre, Michael & Nagel, David & A. Chubb, Talbot & J. Hekman, Randall. (2004). New physical effects in metal deuterides. 10.1142/9789812774354_0003.

⁹ DOE SC (2004). Report of the review of low energy nuclear reactions. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science. Retrieved Aug 5, 2019, from https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Report_of_the_Review_of_Low_Energy_Nuclear_Reactions