

Editorial by the Editors-in-Chief regarding the highlighted paper “Time-resolved hydrino continuum transitions with cutoffs at 22.8 nm and 10.1 nm” by R.L. Mills and Y. Lu

The Editors-in-Chief of the EPJ D wish to clarify that the publication of the highlighted paper “Time-resolved hydrino continuum transitions with cutoffs at 22.8 nm and 10.1 nm” by R.L. Mills and Y. Lu [[Eur. Phys. J. D 64, 65–72 \(2011\)](#)] is in no way an endorsement of the authors’ “hydrino” hypothesis by the Editors of this journal.

We, the Editors-in-Chief of the EPJ D, wish to publish an editorial statement preceding the highlighted paper “Time-resolved hydrino continuum transitions with cutoffs at 22.8 nm and 10.1 nm” by R.L. Mills and Y. Lu. These authors describe the results of emission spectroscopic studies of a low-energy, high-current pinch discharge in pure hydrogen as well as in other gases. They observe continuous emission bands from respectively 22.8 nm and 10.1 nm towards longer wavelengths only when hydrogen is used as the operating gas. The authors interpret these observations as a manifestation of the “hydrino” hypothesis, which they have been promoting for some time. The “hydrino” hypothesis refers to a theory of atomic hydrogen that postulates the existence of energy levels below the known $n = 1$ ground level of atomic hydrogen with fractional quantum numbers. Because of the profound consequences of the existence of such levels in conjunction with statistical mechanics for various areas of physics and chemistry, this hypothesis is controversial and has opponents as well as proponents in the scientific community. Despite the reservations about the “hydrino” hypothesis expressed by some members of the scientific community, we decided that, after ensuring that the paper passed all necessary refereeing procedures (review by two independent senior members of the academic community), we should publish this paper rather than silence the discussion by rejecting it. We view this as the most effective way to stimulate scientific discourse, encourage debate, and engage in a meaningful dialogue about what is admittedly a controversial postulate.

We would therefore like to invite the scientific community, opponents and proponents of the “hydrino” hypothesis alike, to send us their comments and views. All comments received that are suitable for publication will undergo the standard review process for comments prior to publication.

Kurt H. Becker, Nigel. J. Mason, and Claude Fabre