Hi Ibrahim,  
  
Hope all is well and you had a nice weekend. I heard back from the attorney an he asked about a couple of things that we need to include in the report of the turbines and comparisons. Here is what he wrote:  
  
Conrad,  
  
Thanks. I do not see anything in your report about what features of Geert's device make it superior to others'. Recall that ultimately we need to be able to state that certain features of Geert's device unexpectedly result in superior performance to turbines without those features. Two features we had discussed are "the ratio of the distance between the second vane ends of two consecutive vanes and the distance between the second blade ends of two consecutive blades of the rotor is given by a factor A which can assume values from 2.6 on" and "the cavity is cylindrical with a diameter, the diameter of the rotor being approximately 2.875 multiplied by the diameter of the cavity". This does not necessarily need to be in the report, but you would have to sign a sworn declaration that is true.  
  
Truly yours  
Cliff  
  
we are just trying to show the differences and showing how Geert's, is different. Like the "Moment of Inertia" that you were talking about and other features that show on the graphs and CFD that there is a difference and how it improved from the others, even if only on the lower to medium wind speeds, which in reality are more realistic than using very high wind speeds that don't happen often.  
  
Thank you very much,  
  
Conrad