Dear Kirk,P

Thanks a lot for contributing to the debate, and for sharing your story.

Now this is really interesting.

You developed a stove that is, from what I read, highly performing.

You needed to use a lab protocol to develop it, you used the WBT. You say it allowed you to improve the stove, to the level it is today.

*“Perhaps the same results could have been achieved without the WBT, but I could not have measured them, so there might have been changes in the stove that made no improvement because I couldn’t test them.  A lot of luck would have been involved.”*

You could have improved your stove while using another lab protocol. There are other lab protocols allowing to measure the performance without relying on luck, of course there are.

The questions that I think of: were some of the results of the WBT useful, some other misleading? All of them useful? Did you develop and improve your stove thank to, or despite the WBT? Would you have made your stove better with another lab protocol, or worse?

It would be great to compare the way you did the testing with the WBT, and the way you would have done it with another lab protocol. And see how results may have differed.

Can people working with other protocols on the List react?

Best,

Xavier