

February 27, 1991

Professor Ralph Greif  
Dept. of Mechanical Engineering  
University of California at Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA 94720

ventuno press  
6792 Timberwood Drive  
West Chester, Ohio 45069  
U.S.A.

Telephone (513) 777-0944

Dear Professor Greif,

Enclosed is a copy of the 1964 version of the nucleate boiling manuscript I submitted for presentation at your upcoming session. Please note that:

- The enclosure is a copy of the galley I received from the AIChE Journal.
- As indicated on page 4, Professor/Editor Bliss accepted the article on April 21, 1964.
- The article was *NOT* published in 1964 (or ever) because a "responsible person" (as Professor Bliss described him) learned of the article prior to publication, and requested that it not be published.
- Page 4 incorrectly states that the article was presented at an AIChE meeting. It has never been presented. Professor Bliss wrongly *assumed* that the quality of the manuscript would ensure its acceptance.

In my view, the reviews you sent me are unacceptable because they are not truly responsive to the material in the manuscript, and their reasoning is unsound. The manuscript states that the power law with exponent 3 results from drawing straight lines on log log paper, and points out that this induction methodology is not rigorous because it implicitly assumes there is no additive constant. The manuscript uses rigorous induction methodology to correlate benchmark data by Nukiyama, Cichelli and Bonilla, Berenson, Hesse, and others. It concludes that the data are highly linear, and that there is an additive constant (which should be expected *a priori* since boiling requires a finite  $\Delta T$ ).

The reviews you sent me reject my sound and simple thesis for the following unsound reasons:


- There is much scatter in boiling data, and a power law is good enough for design. (Has this reviewer noticed that the standard deviation in the data cited is much less than 1 C? Has he actually read the manuscript?)
- The power law is implied by theoretical models and "fundamental studies" and dimensional analysis. (Don't these reviewers know that the scientific method is induction *BEFORE* deduction? Don't they know that Nature dictates behavior--not models and theories and studies?)
- Demonstrating that the data are linear is not sufficient "to fully refute the power law". (This statement is patently ridiculous. Data is both necessary and sufficient to establish behavior.)

- The linear relationship "may be difficult to generalize in terms of the pressure as the parameter". (This would NOT be difficult, although I can well believe it might be difficult for this reviewer.)
- The manuscript analyzes the data only over a narrow region, and that is why it can be approximated by a linear relationship. (This is a polite way of saying I am dishonest. I have in fact analyzed the data over the full nucleate boiling region, but I have not included non-boiling data with boiling data. Surely boiling correlations should describe boiling behavior.)
- In reference to the assumption implicit in drawing straight lines on log log paper, one reviewer states: "I have never seen anybody apply this constraint." This comment demonstrates that the reviewer does not know the meaning of the word "implicit"!

I am sure your advice to revise my nucleate boiling article in line with the reviewers' comments was well intended. But I will not do that because the manuscript in its present form is correct, and I will not make it less than correct. I would rather it went unpublished for another 30 years.

I hope you will decide to reject these unacceptable reviews, and that you will make the final decision on accepting/rejecting my manuscript.

Sincerely,



Eugene F. Adiutori