

From: Dario Crosetto [mailto:crosetto@att.net]

Sent: Sunday, January 30, 2011 2:59 PM

To: 'sandro centro'

Cc: 'Vincenzo VIGNA'; Michele.CASELLE@cern.ch; FIOLE@cern.ch; Andrea.CATINACCIO@cern.ch; James.CATMORE@cern.ch; Matteo.CAVALLI-SFORZA@cern.ch; Flavio.CAVANNA@cern.ch; Christian.CAVATA@cern.ch; Patrizia.CENCI@cern.ch; Filippo.CERADINI@cern.ch; Piergiorgio.CERELLO@cern.ch; Anna.CERESOLE@cern.ch; Irakli.CHAKABERIA@cern.ch; Sunghyun.CHANG@cern.ch; Bertrand.CHAPLEAU@cern.ch; Alexandre.CHARPY@cern.ch; Jean-Luc.CHARVET@cern.ch; Despina.CHATZIFOTIADOU@cern.ch; Sushil.CHAUHAN@cern.ch; Gueorgui.CHELKOV@cern.ch; Hesheng.CHEN@cern.ch; Hucheng.CHEN@cern.ch; Min.CHEN@cern.ch; Yan.CHEN@cern.ch; Maxwell.CHERTOK@cern.ch; Harry.CHEUNG@cern.ch; Emilio.CHIAVASSA@cern.ch; 'Vincenzo Chiochia'; Massimiliano.CHIORBOLI@cern.ch; Mokhtar.CHMEISSANI@cern.ch; Georgios.CHOUDALAKIS@cern.ch; Panos.CHRISTAKOGLOU@cern.ch; Tim.CHRISTIANSEN@cern.ch; Electra.CHRISTIDI@cern.ch; Jiri.CHUDOBA@cern.ch; Tatsuya.CHUJO@cern.ch; Ondrej.CHVALA@cern.ch; Krzysztof.CIBA@cern.ch; Luisa.CIFARELLI-STROLIN@cern.ch; Mattia.CINQUILLI@cern.ch; papifab@yahoo.it; 'Vanna Sereno'; info@pec.vincenzovigna.it; v.vigna@smatteo.pv.it; 'Federico Ferrini'; 'Gianni Zumerle'; 'ALESSANDRO BETTINI'; segreteria.martini@sanita.it

Subject: RE: Response to CERN leader SC, member of CERN Finance Committee, Chairman of I.L.O., Reviewer at LERB and DRDC for LHC at CERN, Spokesman for several collaborations

Subject:

Response to CERN leader SC, member of CERN Finance Committee, Chairman of I.L.O., Reviewer at LERB and DRDC for LHC at CERN, Spokesman for several collaborations

Dear Sandro Centro,

I have no problem pointing out as you requested, what is “*not true*” in what you wrote.

One thing should be clear, that my answers should not be interpreted as a fight with you, they are not aimed at you personally, but are in defense of the interest of cancer patients and it is my professional responsibility (just as it is of any reader of this message who should not take my side or your side) to take the side of science and of the interest of the people. By not retracting your untrue statement, your action would be to the detriment of taxpayers and damaging to cancer patients.

Dr. Vigna sent you a request to suggest any possible motivated and constructive observations to the rules of the competition for the most efficient solution in particle detection for early cancer diagnosis in order to objectively identify the project that offers the greatest impact in reducing cancer deaths in the world and instead you answered dismissing a scientific procedure and crashing innovations, progress and science to the benefit of cancer patient (See rules for the competition at http://www.leonardodavinciprize.org/leonardo_da_vinci_prize.htm).

I think taxpayers and cancer patients have the right to pursue and obtain the results from the ongoing scientific procedure at the University of Pavia. The rules of the Leonardo da Vinci competition, crafted with the interest of the people in mind and submitted to public scrutiny at the international level, implements such scientific procedure to guarantee the highest impact in cancer death reduction. For this reason when a philanthropist who participated at the workshop in Pavia on October 28, 2010, proposed a prize of 50,000 euro if I could show my project to be superior to the project that won the first prize at the workshop at CERN “Physics for Health” in 2010, I promptly said that the prize should go to the best project in the world and not be limited to Axial-PET or the 3D-CBS. This is the reason the competition was extended to the world.

Your action in your email, if not corrected by you, is not only an unwarranted attack on SCIENTIFIC PROCEDURES as mentioned above, but reveals to all people who ask why my innovations (although increases efficiency and lowers costs, thus promoting progress and benefits for mankind) did not receive funding from Decision Makers like you who handle the funds made available from taxpayers.

Because you are an important Decision Maker in the field who holds several positions of responsibility at CERN and in several public institutions, your action, although an opinion not supported by scientific arguments (and as such should be questionable), if not taken back and corrected, is an additional block to bringing the benefit of my innovations to the bed of the patient. (See other three blocks on page 7 at www.crosettofoundation.org/uploads/411.pdf).

People who understand the essence and value of my innovations, without your “symbolic” answer would not have understood why my innovations have been blocked for such a long time. (Following is a list of the position of responsibility that can be found on your web site: member of CERN Finance Committee, member of CERN Technology Transfer –TT-; president of the TT and Patents Committees of INFN, Chairman of the Industrial Liaison Officer, *-I.L.O.- Forum* at CERN, responsible in **2003** for a research project on liquid Argon TPC for **200K€** The project continued in **2005** with addition of Milan University and funded by MIUR with **372K€**, and funded in **2007** for **245K€** Since **1997** SC is responsible for a project funded by EEC for the development of a Cardiac Imaging Chamber. Member of LERB -LHC Electronics Review Board- of CERN, member of the DRDC -Detector Research & Development Committee- at CERN for evaluating LHC proposals; member of the CMS -Compact Muon Solenoid- at CERN for the LHC -Large Hadron Collider- program. Since **2003** deputy spokesman of the ICARUS experiment at the Gran Sasso Laboratory. Director of the "Master in Progettazione Microelettronica" organized by Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università di Padova in cooperation con InfineonTechnologies, STmicroelectronics, INFN and CERN)

By sending your email not only to the 46 recipients of Dr. Vigna's request for comments to the rules, but also to the Director of the Gran Sasso Laboratory, Prof. Alessandro Bettini; to the Member of CERN Council Committee, Finance Committee: head of Italian Delegation, Prof. Federico Ferrini; to an experimental physicist from the University of Padua, Prof. Gianni Zumerle and to the Secretary of the Ministry of Health in Italy , your action can be interpreted as a request to support you in your attack on a SCIENTIFIC PROCEDURE. Nevertheless, as science follows the laws of nature, it is expected that these additional recipients will instead support the scientific procedure that will make prevail the scientific truth for the benefit of mankind, and that there will be many true scientists contributing to the rules of the competition to make them more precise. For example the contribution given by the Deputy Spokesman of Atlas experiment, Prof. Andy Lankford, who, when Dr. Vigna and I met with him at CERN on January 12, 2011, agreed that the objective of measuring the superiority in efficiency of one project with respect to the other was correct as it was also achieving the minimum cost, but the rules should specify in item 9 on page 5 which of the two is more important and specify the criteria defining it.

We also met with CERN Scientific Director, prof. Sergio Bertolucci who agreed that the objective of the efficiency was the best for establishing the superiority of one project with respect to another, but he had some comments on the lower cost that still need to be addressed.

Having defined the rules for the competition that in order to achieve the highest efficiency it is necessary to demonstrate the capability of obtaining the greatest ratio (with some relation to cost) between the number of 511 KeV pairs of photons captured divided by the number of 511 KeV pairs of photons emitted, the reviewers and authors of the different projects should verify if the values claimed by each project are supported by the parameters described in each project (referring to the geometry, crystal density and thickness, sensors that have been used, electronics, etc.). It is a process requiring some calculations referring to the characteristics of different components, and in the event two (or more)

projects come to a disagreement it may be necessary to conduct a small experiment where the results determine who is right and who is wrong. This scientific procedure will make the scientific truth prevail and not your opinions that I can demonstrate below with facts and documents to be wrong, unsupported by scientific arguments and harmful to the progress and benefit of mankind.

In the event you believe they are not satisfactory and you do not withdraw your accusations, I will be available to discuss this in a public debate in a scientific forum, for example at CERN. However, in the event your false accusations are not retracted and you turn your back on the scientific truth which will benefit mankind through the scientific procedure, I will continue to defend science, progress and the interest of the taxpayers and cancer patients by explaining to layman the advantages of my innovations including the money that CERN could have saved if they had made full use of my innovations in HEP experiments. Furthermore, I will demonstrate the benefits in terms of lives saved that could have been achieved with the improvements in Medical Imaging. I will report to all possible ethic committees in the world the damage caused by not following scientific procedures and attacking it as you did in your statement.

I recommend you study in depth the documents at http://www.3d-computing.com/pb/summary_nss99.pdf also the mental process of IEEE reviewer Les Rogers who, after receiving an award from IEEE-NSS-MIC conference in Lyon (France), was appointed to review my invention by senior scientist Aaron Brill. In these documents you can see how Les Rogers viewpoint based initially on preconceived concepts in trigger and the classical pipelining technique changed toward understanding correctly my innovation. As he read through my documents his drawings representing what he understood to that point progressively changed reflecting his new understanding as he grasped the real meaning and value of my invention.

As a general comment to your email, your statements recall the principle of “authority” and sound pretty much like the “ipse-dixit” (he said so) common in the Middle Ages, which should have nothing to do with science because the scientific truth is not based on the authoritarian statement of a person, neither is it a popularity contest that needs the approval of the majority of the scientists, but is based on the laws of nature. If only 1% of scientists claim with supporting scientific arguments that the earth is not at the center of the universe and 99% believe that it is, the law of nature that it is not (the center of the universe) is what it matters, not the opinion of the majority. It’s only a matter of time, but history will make the truth prevail, even if it takes decades or centuries to recognize that unsupported statements like yours are untrue and wrong.

Although my task should be just that of restating the key elements of my inventions and its advantages that are thoroughly described in several documents, for completeness and in order to satisfy your request, I will prove point-by-point what is not true in your statements.

1. It is **NOT TRUE** what you said in the following statement: “...he [Crossetto] *continue to advertise its useless (and nonexistent) invention...*”.

Before my inventions in this field starting circa 1992 when I presented them within 35 days at three international conferences in Europe and the U.S. (Annecy, Fr. 21-25 Sept. 1992. CERN-92-07. pp. 803-806; Corpus Christi, TX, Sept. 29–Oct. 2, 1992. World Scientific pp. 553-566; IEEE-NSS-MIC, Orlando, FL, Oct. 25-31. 1992) and published in the prestigious scientific journals: Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research and IEEE-NSS-MIC (NIM A311:49-56, 1992; NIM, A315, 1992, 487-490; IEEE-NSS-MIC, Conf. Proc. 1992) the High Energy Physics community, in order to implement the first level trigger, had to use expensive, fast electronics (Ga-As, ECL, etc.) that could execute only simple trigger algorithms consisting of a limited number of non-programmable operations without the neighboring data exchange capability for each electronic channel through the entire array with no boundaries (it was common to use only the “sliding window

technique”). Now, after my invention, there is no need to use expensive, fast electronics. Programmability, higher performance, communication with no boundaries with adjacent channels is possible. The cost is also reduced. This change is a direct result of my inventions (supported by conspicuous documentation in articles, books, presentations at several International conferences, Universities, Research Laboratories, etc.). Therefore, contrary to what you stated, my invention exists and its advantages in increased performance and lower cost demonstrate to be useful. Furthermore my invention was recognized by an international public scientific review at FERMIlab on December 14, 1993 that was requested by the SSCL Director. The review panel clearly recognized the invention as one which would open a new frontier in particle detection with the written statement: “...given this feature [3D-Flow architecture] experimenters would probably think of clever uses not now possible.” One key element of the invention is the “bypass switch” and “bypass register” between different layers of the 3D-Flow processor array. Another is the segmentation of the detectors arranged to cover a “view angle” that would define the electronic channels. Another was the point-to-point coupling of the detector array (cones of “view angles”) with processor arrays. (See <http://www.crosettofoundation.com/uploads/291.pdf>). (See also, later in this message, the references to subsequent publications, documentation, four books, presentations to hospitals, universities, research centers, including CERN on 01/12/1998 and BNL on 09/24/2009 that I made from 1992 to date. Upon request video recordings can be provided of most of these presentations followed with a debate, which total to hundreds of hours of video recording).

2. It is **NOT TRUE** what you said in the following statement: “...*has absolutely nothing to suggest that could serve cancer patients...*”.

My 3D-CBS invention allows the capture of more valid pairs of 511 KeV photons more accurately, at a lower cost per photon captured, and with a higher capability to filter noise. Slide 35 of the presentation I gave at the University of Pavia on October 28, 2010 summarizes the parameters that need to be measured (photon energy, arrival time, “x”, “y”, “z” coordinates of the incident photon in the crystal and noise filter). The subsequent slides detail how to perform such measurements accurately and at low cost (See <http://www.crosettofoundation.com/uploads/414.pdf>).

The advantages of my invention were even recognized by a senior officer from General Electric Medical Imaging who wrote an email (a copy is available upon motivated request) to a scientist at CERN stating that I gave a great contribution to the field of medical imaging.

In 2001, the President and Director of PET of Siemens Medical Imaging came for a one day meeting at my laboratory. Conference calls took place during the following weeks with Siemens Director of Advanced research and Director of Electronics. Siemens Medical Imaging chain of command stated on numerous occasions that they had done all possible tests, built over 17 prototypes and were convinced they could not improve the efficiency of their PET. This was contrary to what I claimed was possible with my inventions that foresaw also the improvement of electronics. In fact, five years later, in 2007, Siemens announced on their web site that experimental results show improvement to the efficiency of their PET by 70% thanks to the improvement of the electronics.

3. It is **NOT TRUE** what you said in the following statement: “...*Its trigger system, never taken seriously by any of the LHC experiments...*”.

My trigger system was instead included in the Technical Design Report of the half billion dollar GEM experiment at SSCL and indeed was adopted by the LHCb experiment as reported on page 83-84 in the LHCb Letter of Intent CERN/LHCC 95-5, LHCC/I8, 25 August 1995 and also on page 102-104 in the LHCb Technical Design Report CERN/LHCC 98-4 LHCC/P4 20 February 1998. (See peer-reviewed article published in Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Sec. A, vol. 436 - 1999. pp. 341-385). Subsequently, for political and economical reasons (for sure not scientific) funding was cut by the U.S. Department of Energy of both GEM and LHCb experiments (See

<http://www.crosettofoundation.com/uploads/309.pdf>). However, a scientist can only reject a claim with scientific arguments; rejecting a scientific truth because others do not recognize it is like rejecting Galileo for stating that the earth is not at the center of the universe because others did not recognize this. On the contrary, if a claim cannot be disproved scientifically, those who “do not take it seriously into consideration” should be rejected.

4. It is **NOT TRUE** what you said in the following statement: “...does not appear to have ever worked...”.

The first proof of concept was achieved by building in hardware in two FPGA Altera a system with eight 3D-Flow processors in two layers and connected North-East-West-South. This system was shown working at a booth at the Industrial Exhibition of the IEEE-NSS-MIC Conference in San Diego (CA) in 2001, provided free of charge by Chris Parkman from CERN. Timing and performance was shown from signals displayed on the oscilloscope and visitors could select their pattern of clusters on input board switches and see if the selected cluster was identified by the real-time algorithm; results were displayed on the LED of the output board. The engineering of the concept in hardware for building a 3D-Flow system for an industrial device for clinical use was achieved by designing, building and testing two boards, each with 68 processors. This system was also shown to be working to inspectors from ABO Project who reviewed the entire project for four days in Dallas during 17 hours of meetings (all video recorded). At the conclusion they filled out and signed a questionnaire which approved and witnessed the advantages of the system (See the questionnaire at <http://www.crosettofoundation.com/uploads/162.pdf>)

5. It is **NOT TRUE** what you said in the following statement: “...and adds nothing to diagnostic...”.

The 3D-Flow system allows the use of economical crystals thanks to the increased capability to accurately extract information from the photon’s total energy, arrival time, “x”, “y”, “z” coordinates of the incident photon in the crystal and filter noise. This allows an increase in the length of the detector (FOV) to capture more photons while keeping the cost of the device at a reasonable price (only 2.5 times the current cost with an increase in efficiency of over 400 times compared to current PET). The result is a reduction of the radiation to the patient to about 1/30, permitting a safe screening and enabling early cancer detection. These are clear advantages that save lives as experimental data demonstrates that early detection saves lives (See <http://www.crosettofoundation.com/uploads/354.pdf>).

6. It is **NOT TRUE** what you said in the following statement: “...Just visit the sites listed <<http://www.crosettofoundation.com/home.php>> and you understand that in the case of D.C. we face a phenomenon which has nothing to do with science...”

If at the mentioned website there are any non scientific data, or any calculations that you believe are incorrect, then provide the data and calculation that you believe to be correct. In the event of any significant difference between your data and calculations and mine, as scientists we should agree to an experiment proving who is right. However, first, based on the ethical code of a scientist, you must prove your claim that it “has nothing to do with science” with supporting scientific arguments. In absence of this support it would be legitimate to think that you are slandering, and damaging the citizens and cancer patients by trying to block innovations and progress with false statements (See <http://www.crosettofoundation.com/uploads/371.pdf>).

7. It is **NOT TRUE** what you said in the following statement: “...Among many amenities there is also an endless list of the inventor’s answers to relevant physicists (among them the Nobel laureate J. Steinberger) but no document that tells us what the physicists wrote to him and what they think of the invention...”

Since my first invention many relevant physicists have written to me (for examples Director, Division Leader, Group Leaders, Spokesmen of the most prestigious research centers in the world : CERN,

SSCL, FERMIlab, BNL and relevant physicists most prestigious Universities). The list of the role of responsibility of the leaders in the field from the four most important laboratories in the world who wrote notes of merit about my invention are reported on page 6 of www.crosettofoundation.org/uploads/411.pdf). The content of these notes expressing merit and thoughts on my invention can be found at www.crosettofoundation.org/uploads/167.pdf. Additional comments to my book “400+ Times Improved PET Efficiency for Lower-Dose Radiation, Lower-Cost Cancer Screening” ISBN-10: 0970289707 can be found from reviewers at Amazon (http://www.amazon.com/Efficiency-Lower-Dose-Radiation-Lower-Cost-Screening/product-reviews/0970289707/ref=dp_db_cm_cr_acr_txt?ie=UTF8&showViewpoints=1).

To a pertinent and legitimate question Steinberger answered responsibly and as a gentlemen when he said he was not competent on the electronics of trigger systems. While other experts in the field who have positions of responsibility in Trigger and DAQ did not respond.

8. It is NOT TRUE what you said in the following statement: “...*It is extremely serious, even involving people in good faith, trying to collect funds that could easily find better destination for an adventure that has significance only for the private of D.C.*”

Perhaps you did not read carefully Dr. Vigna’s message and the draft of the rules of the Leonardo da Vinci Prize. The money collected is for the prize for the most efficient solution in particle detection for early cancer diagnosis in order to objectively identify the project that offers the greatest impact in reducing cancer deaths in the world. As I mentioned before, when a philanthropist proposed a prize to me of 50,000 euro if I could show my project to be superior to the project that won the first prize at the workshop at CERN “Physics for Health” in 2010, I instead said that all projects in the world should have the possibility to win the prize and since it should be awarded to the best project in the world the competition should be extended to all other projects targeted to reduce cancer death. Effort should be put into suggesting improvements to the rules that will identify the project in particle detection with highest impact in reducing cancer death with suggestions such as the one provided by the Deputy Spokesman of Atlas experiment.

As I answered you with supporting arguments (in order to respond also to those who expect a clarification to your accusations) you now owe me an explanation as to why someone with your experience and position of responsibility would say so many false accusations.

Furthermore, your request at the end of your message dated January 17, 2011 to keep this message CONFIDENTIAL among the 50 people on the list is unacceptable because this issue is of primary importance for cancer patients who, after all, are funding CERN and cancer research with their tax dollars. In order to avoid the problem to explain the usefulness of CERN and of the research aimed to reduce cancer death (as was the case at the Superconducting Super Collider which was closed by the U.S. Congress when physicists were unable to explain to layman the return in benefits from the activity of the Laboratory) it is urgent to seriously address this issue so, that **RESEARCH WILL BE DIRECTED TO FIND THE LINK BETWEEN: the improvement in EFFICIENCY IN CAPTURING MORE PHOTONS at a lower cost per photon captured AND THE BENEFIT OF THE REDUCTION OF PREMATURE CANCER DEATH.**

Only by finding this connection it will be possible to start a paradigm change that will generate a turn of events in the fight against cancer that will finally achieve a substantial reduction in premature cancer death.

Sincerely,
Dario Crosetto

From: sandro centro [mailto:Sandro.CENTRO@cern.ch]

Sent: Monday, January 17, 2011 7:59 AM

To: Dario Crosetto

Cc: sandro centro; 'Vincenzo VIGNA'; Michele.CASELLE@cern.ch; FIOLE@cern.ch; Andrea.CATINACCIO@cern.ch; James.CATMORE@cern.ch; Matteo.CAVALLI-SFORZA@cern.ch; Flavio.CAVANNA@cern.ch; Christian.CAVATA@cern.ch; Patrizia.CENCI@cern.ch; Filippo.CERADINI@cern.ch; Piergiorgio.CERELLO@cern.ch; Anna.CERESOLE@cern.ch; Irakli.CHAKABERIA@cern.ch; Sunghyun.CHANG@cern.ch; Bertrand.CHAPLEAU@cern.ch; Philippe.CHARPENTIER@cern.ch; Alexandre.CHARPY@cern.ch; Jean-Luc.CHARVET@cern.ch; Despina.CHATZIFOTIADOU@cern.ch; Sushil.CHAUHAN@cern.ch; Gueorgui.CHELKOV@cern.ch; Hesheng.CHEN@cern.ch; Hucheng.CHEN@cern.ch; Min.CHEN@cern.ch; Yan.CHEN@cern.ch; Maxwell.CHERTOK@cern.ch; Harry.CHEUNG@cern.ch; Emilio.CHIAVASSA@cern.ch; 'Vincenzo Chiochia'; Massimiliano.CHIORBOLI@cern.ch; Mokhtar.CHMEISSANI@cern.ch; Georgios.CHOUDALAKIS@cern.ch; Panos.CHRISTAKOGLU@cern.ch; Tim.CHRISTIANSEN@cern.ch; Electra.CHRISTIDI@cern.ch; Jiri.CHUDOBA@cern.ch; Tatsuya.CHUJO@cern.ch; Ondrej.CHVALA@cern.ch; Krzysztof.CIBA@cern.ch; Luisa.CIFARELLI-STROLIN@cern.ch; Mattia.CINQUILLI@cern.ch; papifab@yahoo.it; 'Vanna Sereno'; info@pec.vincenzovigna.it; v.vigna@smatteo.pv.it; 'Federico Ferrini'; 'Gianni Zumerle'; 'ALESSANDRO BETTINI'; segreteria.martini@sanita.it

Subject: Re: I: Fwd: I: Premio Leonardo da Vinci - Richiesta di commenti al regolamento(scadenza 31 gennaio). Object Leonardo da Vinci Prize - request for comments to the rules (deadline Jan. 31)

Dear Crosetto,

I just like to confirm what I wrote in the attached letter. It is up to you to show I wrote something not true.

Regards

Sandro Centro

On Jan 17, 2011, at 07:19 AM, Dario Crosetto wrote:

Dear Dr. Centro,

I have know you for years, teaching "logic" and "electronics" from the text books (from back in 1980) and I am surprised and puzzle that you do not grasp the advantages of my invention and deny the evidence of its recognition by many scientists, including by a formal review panel who reviewed it publicly for an entire day at Fermi National Laboratory (FNAL) on December 14, 1993 (I presented my innovation publicly to scientists at FNAL auditorium and at several close sessions before the review panel).

The review panel recognized the scientific merit of my invention and provided \$150,000 from the SSC (Superconducting Supercollider) closeout budget to document it "for potential future use." I documented it in several articles and publication (also in a 45 page article at Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Sec. A, vol. 436 (1999) pp. 341-385).

It is not my fault if some people do not understand it and do not provide scientific arguments to reject it.

I was informed by colleagues that a few years ago you wrote a letter to several scientists slandering my work without providing scientific arguments in support of your statements as it is instead the

responsibility of a true scientist. I would like to ask you to provide me a copy of such letter so that I can reply point-by-point to your statements.

In science issues are addressed with supporting scientific arguments, please provide specific references to first level trigger systems for particle detection (including detection of photons in medical imaging) that are superior in performance flexibility and lower in cost compared to mine described in the article mentioned above and in several other articles, documents, books that I published.

I will be glad to answer point-by-point in writing and in a public debate to your statements and claims which should be specific and supported by facts, documents and scientific arguments, not generic as you wrote in your email below. The document

at www.crosettofoundation.org/uploads/411.pdf answers to some of the questions about why benefits of my innovations are still delayed. (A copy of such document in Italian will soon be available at www.crosettofoundation.org/uploads/411.it.pdf)

Regards,

Dario Crosetto

From: sandro centro [mailto:Sandro.CENTRO@cern.ch]

Sent: Monday, January 17, 2011 2:59 AM

To: Vincenzo VIGNA

Cc: sandro centro; Michele.CASELLE@cern.ch; FIOLEHAIS@cern.ch; Andrea.CATINACCIO@cern.ch; James.CATMORE@cern.ch; Matteo.CAVALLI-SFORZA@cern.ch; Flavio.CAVANNA@cern.ch; Christian.CAVATA@cern.ch; Patrizia.CENCI@cern.ch; Filippo.CERADINI@cern.ch; Piergiorgio.CERELLO@cern.ch; Anna.CERESOLE@cern.ch; Irakli.CHAKABERIA@cern.ch; Sunghyun.CHANG@cern.ch; Bertrand.CHAPLEAU@cern.ch; Philippe.CHARPENTIER@cern.ch; Alexandre.CHARPY@cern.ch; Jean-Luc.CHARVET@cern.ch; Despina.CHATZIFOTIADOU@cern.ch; Sushil.CHAUHAN@cern.ch; Gueorgui.CHELKOV@cern.ch; Hesheng.CHEN@cern.ch; Hucheng.CHEN@cern.ch; Min.CHEN@cern.ch; Yan.CHEN@cern.ch; Maxwell.CHERTOK@cern.ch; Harry.CHEUNG@cern.ch; Emilio.CHIAVASSA@cern.ch; Vincenzo Chiochia; Massimiliano.CHIORBOLI@cern.ch; Mokhtar.CHMEISSANI@cern.ch; Georgios.CHOUDALAKIS@cern.ch; Panos.CHRISTAKOGLU@cern.ch; Tim.CHRISTIANSEN@cern.ch; Electra.CHRISTIDI@cern.ch; Jiri.CHUDOBA@cern.ch; Tatsuya.CHUJO@cern.ch; Ondrej.CHVALA@cern.ch; Krzysztof.CIBA@cern.ch; Luisa.CIFARELLI-STROLIN@cern.ch; Mattia.CINQUILLI@cern.ch; papifab@yahoo.it; info@3d-computing.com; Vanna Sereno; info@pec.vincenzovigna.it; v.vigna@smatteo.pv.it; Federico Ferrini; Gianni Zumerle; ALESSANDRO BETTINI; segreteria.martini@sanita.it

Subject: Re: I: Fwd: I: Premio Leonardo da Vinci - Richiesta di commenti al regolamento(scadenza 31 gennaio). Object Leonardo da Vinci Prize - request for comments to the rules (deadline Jan. 31)

Dear Dr. Vigna

I think Dario Crosetto, I've known for years for the tenacity with which he continues to advertise its useless (and nonexistent) invention, has absolutely nothing to suggest that could serve for cancer patients.

Its trigger system, never taken seriously by any of the LHC experiment, does not appear to have ever worked and adds nothing to diagnostic.

Just visit the sites listed

<<http://www.crosettofoundation.com/home.php>> and you understand that in the case of D.C. we face a phenomenon which has nothing to do with science. Among many amenities there is also an endless list of the inventor's *answers* to relevant physicists (among them the Nobel laureate J. Steinberger) but no document that tells us what the physicists wrote to him and what they think of the invention.

It is extremely serious, even involving people in good faith, trying to collect funds that could easily find better destination for an adventure that has significance only for the private of D.C.

Greetings

Sandro Centro

On Jan 17, 2011, at 00:33 AM, Vincenzo VIGNA wrote:

Sandro Centro

http://www.pd.infn.it/~centro/mia_c_web.html

Industrial Liaison Officer for Italy in CERN

Chair of *I.L.O. Forum*

<http://www.pd.infn.it/ilo/>

Italian Delegate at External Network for Technology Transfer in CERN

<http://technologytransfer.web.cern.ch/TechnologyTransfer/>

Dip. di Fisica "Galileo Galilei"

via F. Marzolo 8

I 35131 Padova (Italy)

tel. direct: +39 049 8277056

mobile: +39 333 4358752

tel. secretary: +39 049 8277080 (Cristina Miletti)

fax: +39 049 8756233