



## Psy-Tek Labs, LLC

### Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab

#### GDV measurements of charged and noncharged oil:

#### Preliminary study

**Date:** April 30, 2015

**Principal Investigator:** Gaétan Chevalier, Ph.D., Research Director (Bio in Appendix A)

**Co-Investigator:** Jessica Luibrand, BS, CCT, CCTT, Subtle Energy Researcher (Bio in Appendix B)

#### Abstract

Arrowhead spring water was exposed to oil treated with KitCore Enhancement Technology for one day. Compared to a sample of Arrowhead spring water exposed to oil not treated with KitCore Enhancement Technology for the same duration, the Arrowhead spring water exposed to oil treated with KitCore Enhancement Technology released more electrons but with a lower average energy, making the water more prone to release electrons that neutralize oxidative stress involved in inflammatory processes present in a human body. However, KitCore Enhancement Technology did not change Form Coefficient, Entropy and Spatial Fractality between the two water samples suggesting the same level of homogeneous distribution of the molecules inside the samples.

#### Goal

This pilot project was designed to find out energetic differences as seen by the Electro-Photonic Imager/Gas Discharge Visualization (EPI/GDV; details in Appendix C) between two samples of Arrowhead spring water, one in a jar with oil in it and another sample jar containing Arrowhead spring water with oil treated with KitCore Enhancement Technology in it.

#### Statement of Work

Two containers one with oil enhanced with KitCore Enhancement Technology (i.e. charged oil) and another with oil not enhanced were delivered to Psy-Tek Laboratory. Each oil was added to its own jar filled with Arrowhead spring water and left there for at 24 hours. Both jars were filled with water from the same bottle. Each jar constitutes a sample for the purpose of analysis. The two water samples were compared for differences in specific parameters of the EPI/GDV according to the protocol described next.



## Psy-Tek Labs, LLC

### Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab

#### Protocol

Six 6 drops were measured twice, for a total of 24 measurements, 12 for each sample. Two new tuberculin syringes were used, one for each sample. After each use, the syringe was primed with the sample prior to a drop measurement. The GDV captured images at a rate of 5 images per second (or 5 frames per second) for 24 seconds giving 120 images per measurement. For each sample, the 2 measurements taken of the first drop were not use for data analysis, and the first 70 images were discarded from all drop measurements leaving 50 images per measurement  $\times$  2 measurements  $\times$  5 drops = 500 images to analyze per sample. Parameters analyzed included: Area, Average Intensity, Form Coefficient, Entropy and Spatial Fractality.

#### What is the EPI/GDV measuring

The parameters analyzed are: Area, Average Intensity, Form Coefficient, Entropy and Spatial Fractality. Area gives an indication of the energy of the electrons emitted while Average Intensity is proportional to the number of these electrons that are emitted from the sample. A large Area indicates that electrons are easily leaving the sample (lightly bounded to the sample) while a larger Average Intensity indicates a larger number of electrons emitted and thus more electrons are available in the sample to react with positive charges of compounds or molecules in the body and thus more electrons can be transferred to the body resulting in a better absorption of the sample by the body. The 3 other parameters: Form Coefficient, Entropy and Spatial Fractality are related to coherence. A lower value for these parameters would suggest a better coherence or flow of electrons within the molecules of the test sample (suggesting a more homogeneous distribution of the molecules inside the sample).


#### Results

##### *Area*

Figure 1 shows the time series of the 50 images (from frame 71 to frame 120) analyzed for each of the 2 water samples (Sample 1 = water + oil = baseline; Sample 2 = water + oil treated with KitCore Enhancement Technology = Charged Sample) for the Area of the glow around water drops. The first 70 images were removed as per the protocol. Since 10 recordings were used for the analysis of each sample (the first 2 recordings done with the first drop were not used), each point on the graph is the average of 10 data points and the vertical lines represent the confidence intervals for these 10 data points at each frame. If the confidence interval of 2 samples do not overlap, the 2 samples can be considered statistically significantly different. In Figure 1, they clearly do not overlap with the Area of Sample 1, the control sample, being larger than the Area of the charged sample.

## Psy-Tek Labs, LLC

### Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab




Sample 1: *Baseline Mean + confidence interval*  
 Sample 2: *Charged Sample Mean + confidence interval*

**Figure 1:** Area vs. Frames for the 2 water samples. The units of the Area are arbitrary. The vertical bars represent the confidence interval for 10 data points.

Figure 2 present the statistical analysis comparing mean Area of the glow of each sample. As anticipated, Figure 2 shows that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean Areas of the glow of the 2 samples with a probability  $p = 0.0264$ .

## Psy-Tek Labs, LLC

### Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab




**Figure 2:** Statistical comparison between the mean Areas of the two samples. By Student test the samples are statistically significant different with Sample 1 having a significantly larger Area with a probability  $p = 0.00264$ .

#### *Average intensity*

Figure 3 shows the time series of the 50 images (from frame 71 to frame 120) analyzed for each of the 2 water samples (Sample 1 = water + oil = baseline; Sample 2 = water + oil treated with KitCore Enhancement Technology = Charged Sample) for the Average intensity of the glow around water drops. The first 70 images were removed as per the protocol. Since 10 recordings were used for the analysis of each sample (the first 2 recordings done with the first drop were not used), each point on the graph is the average of 10 data points and the vertical lines represent the confidence intervals for these 10 data points and for each frame. If the confidence interval of 2 samples do not overlap, the 2 samples can be considered statistically significantly different. In Figure 3, they clearly do not overlap. The charged sample having a higher Average Intensity than the control sample.

## Psy-Tek Labs, LLC

### Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab




Sample 1: *Baseline Mean + confidence interval*  
 Sample 2: *Charged Sample Mean + confidence interval*

**Figure 3:** Average intensity vs. Frames for the 2 water samples. The units of the Average intensity are arbitrary. The vertical bars represent the confidence interval for 10 data points.

Figure 4 present the statistical analysis comparing Average Intensity of the glow of each sample. As anticipated, Figure 4 shows that the charged sample had a very significant increase in Average Intensity compared to the control sample with a probability  $p = 0.00000680$ .

**Psy-Tek Labs, LLC**  
**Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab**



**Figure 4:** Statistical comparison between the mean Average intensity of the two samples. By Student test the samples are significantly different with the charged sample having a higher Average Intensity with a probability  $p = 0.00000680$ .


***Form coefficient***

Figure 5 shows the time series of the 50 images (from frame 71 to frame 120) analyzed for each of the 2 water samples (Sample 1 = water + oil = baseline; Sample 2 = water + oil treated with KitCore Enhancement Technology = Charged Sample) for the Form coefficient of the glow around water drops. The first 70 images were removed as per the protocol. Since 10 recordings were used for the analysis of each sample (the first 2 recordings done with the first drop were not used), each point on the graph is the average of 10 data points and the vertical lines represent the confidence intervals for these 10 data points and for each frame. If the confidence interval of 2 samples do not overlap, the 2 samples can be considered statistically significantly different. In Figure 5, they clearly overlap.



## Psy-Tek Labs, LLC

### Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab



Sample 1: *Baseline Mean + confidence interval*


Sample 2: *Charged Sample Mean + confidence interval*

**Figure 5:** Form coefficient vs. Frames for the 2 water samples. The units of Form coefficient are arbitrary. The vertical bars represent the confidence interval for 10 data points.

Figure 6 present the statistical analysis comparing mean Form coefficient of the glow of each sample. As anticipated, Figure 6 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean Form coefficients of the glow of the 2 samples with a probability  $p = 0.367$ .

## Psy-Tek Labs, LLC

### Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab



**Figure 6:** Statistical comparison between the mean Form coefficients of the two samples. By Student test the samples have no statistically significant differences with a probability  $p = 0.367$ .


### *Entropy*

Figure 7 shows the time series of the 50 images (from frame 71 to frame 120) analyzed for each of the 2 water samples (Sample 1 = water + oil = baseline; Sample 2 = water + oil treated with KitCore Enhancement Technology = Charged Sample) for the Entropy of the glow around water drops. The first 70 images were removed as per the protocol. Since 10 recordings were used for the analysis of each sample (the first 2 recordings done with the first drop were not used), each point on the graph is the average of 10 data points and the vertical lines represent the confidence intervals for these 10 data points and for each frame. If the confidence interval of 2 samples do not overlap, the 2 samples can be considered statistically significantly different. In Figure 7, they clearly overlap.



## Psy-Tek Labs, LLC

### Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab



Sample 1: *Baseline Mean + confidence interval*


Sample 2: *Charged Sample Mean + confidence interval*

**Figure 7:** Entropy vs. Frames for the 2 water samples. The units of Entropy are arbitrary. The vertical bars represent the confidence interval for 10 data points.

Figure 8 present the statistical analysis comparing mean Entropy of the glow of each sample. As anticipated, Figure 8 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the Entropy of the glow of the 2 samples.

## Psy-Tek Labs, LLC

### Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab




**Figure 8:** Statistical comparison between the mean Entropy of the two samples. By Student test the samples have no statistically significant differences with a probability  $p = 0.356$ .

#### *Spatial fractality*

Figure 9 shows the time series of the 50 images (from frame 71 to frame 120) analyzed for each of the 2 water samples (Sample 1 = water + oil = baseline; Sample 2 = water + oil treated with KitCore Enhancement Technology = Charged Sample) for the Spatial fractality of the glow around water drops. The first 70 images were removed as per the protocol. Since 10 recordings were used for the analysis of each sample (the first 2 recordings done with the first drop were not used), each point on the graph is the average of 10 data points and the vertical lines represent the confidence intervals for these 10 data points and for each frame. If the confidence interval of 2 samples do not overlap, the 2 samples can be considered statistically significantly different. In Figure 9, they clearly overlap.

## Psy-Tek Labs, LLC

### Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab




Sample 1: *Baseline Mean + confidence interval*  
 Sample 2: *Charged Sample Mean + confidence interval*

**Figure 9:** Spatial fractality vs. Frames for the 2 water samples. The units of Spatial Fractality are arbitrary. The vertical bars represent the confidence interval for 10 data points.

Figure 10 present the statistical analysis comparing mean Spatial fractality of the glow of each sample. As anticipated, Figure 10 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the Spatial fractality of the glow of the 2 samples with a probability  $p = 0.148$ .

## Psy-Tek Labs, LLC

### Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab



**Figure 10:** Statistical comparison between the mean Spatial fractality of the two samples. By Student test the samples have no statistically significant differences with a probability  $p = 0.148$ .

### Discussion

GDV analysis showed a significant difference in Area and Average Intensity between the charged and control samples but not in Form Coefficient, Entropy and Spatial Fractality. Since Area gives an indication of the energy of the electrons emitted, it must be concluded that the control sample's emitted electrons had more energy than those of the charged sample on average. Average Intensity is proportional to the number of electrons emitted from the sample. Since the charged sample had a higher Averaged Intensity, it is concluded that the number of electrons (and other small molecules, if any) emitted by the charged sample was higher than for the control sample. This means that, in the case of these oil samples, KitCore Enhancement Technology had the effect of increasing the number of electrons available but decreased their average energy. Still this result is encouraging because it means that KitCore Enhancement Technology enhanced the ability of the oil to release electrons that neutralize free radicals and other positively charged molecules such as those involved in the inflammatory process.



## Psy-Tek Labs, LLC

### Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab

It was decided to put the oil in water as the oil by itself would not give out any glow. This is due to the oil being a good dielectric (or insulating material, one that does not give out its electrons easily). The fact that we see changes in water exposed to the charged oil means that something else besides electrons was given off by the oil. Further it is doubtful that any particle was transferred to the water indicating that what was transferred must be of an energetic nature.

Form Coefficient, Entropy and Spatial Fractality are related to coherence. Since the value for these parameters were the same for both waters in this study, this result suggests the same level of coherence or flow of electrons within the molecules of the test samples (suggesting the same level of homogeneous distribution of the molecules inside the samples).

#### **Conclusion**

The Arrowhead spring water exposed to oil treated with KitCore Enhancement Technology released more electrons but with a lower average energy, making the water more prone to release electrons that neutralize oxidative stress involved in inflammatory processes. This result also implies that KitCore Enhancement Technology increases the absorbability of that water by the body. However, it did not change Form Coefficient, Entropy and Spatial Fractality between the two water samples suggesting the same level of homogeneous distribution of the molecules inside the samples.



**Psy-Tek Labs, LLC**

**Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab**

**APPENDIX A**

**Gaétan Chevalier, Ph.D.,**

**Biographical Sketch**

Dr. Gaétan Chevalier received his Ph.D. from the University of Montréal in Atomic Physics and Laser Spectroscopy. After 4 years of research at UCLA in the field of nuclear fusion, he became professor and Director of Research at the California Institute for Human Science (CIHS) for 10 years doing research on human physiology and electrophysiology. Dr. Chevalier is currently faculty member of CIHS, invited scientist in the Department of Developmental and Cellular Biology at UC Irvine and he has been Director of Research at Psy-Tek since June 2010.



## **Psy-Tek Labs, LLC**

### **Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab**

#### **APPENDIX B**

##### **Jessica Luibrand, BS, CCT, CCTT, Thermographer, Subtle Energy Researcher**

Jessica Luibrand received her Bachelor's degree from Grand Valley State University in Health Sciences while double minoring in Biology & Sociology. Being passionate about alternative and complementary medicine, she facilitated natural health & wellness seminars and discovered field of Thermography. Jessica moved to Florida in order to train under Dr. Carol Chandler, the 'Mother of thermography.' Jessica became a Certified Clinical Thermographer and Clinical Certified Thermography Trainer and trained doctors on how to use the camera, the software, and taught doctors how to incorporate Thermography into their practice. Jessica is the Chief Clinical Director of Psy-Tek Subtle Energy Laboratory & subtle energy researcher.



## Psy-Tek Labs, LLC

### Non-Invasive Scanning and Subtle Energy Testing Lab

#### APPENDIX C

##### EPI/GDV

The Electro-Photonic Imaging (EPI) device, formerly known as Gas Discharge Visualization (GDV), is an advanced form of Kirlian photography developed by Dr. Konstantin Korotkov (Figure C-1). This technology produces an electric impulse, which generates a response of the object in the form of electron and photon emission. The glow of the photon radiation owing to the gas discharge generated from the electromagnetic field is captured by a digital camera and processed by sophisticated software that can perform sophisticated statistical analyses of the data looking and many different parameters such as brightness and size of the glow. Figure 2 shows an example of a gas discharge glow produce around a metal cylinder used to calibrate the EPI/GDV system.



**Figure C-1:** Photograph of GDV Camera pro version 3 designed for measuring drops of liquid. There is a special syringe holder that is placed on top of the black ring which can hold a drop from a syringe just above the glass plate where the measurement is performed.



**Figure C-2:** Example of EPI/GDV image captured from a drop of tap water.