PLENARY ADDRESS: Leighton T G, From pencil to PC to product: taking ideas through experiment and simulation to the ocean and the operating theatre, Theoretical and computational acoustics 2009, Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Theoretical and Computational Acoustics (Dresden, Germany, 7-11 September 2009), (Steffen Marburg, (ed.), Published by Universität der Bundeswehr, 85579 Neubiberg, Germany), pp. 11-28

FROM PENCIL TO PC TO PRODUCT: TAKING IDEAS THROUGH EXPERIMENT AND SIMULATION TO THE OCEAN AND THE OPERATING THEATRE

TIMOTHY G. LEIGHTON

Institute of Sound and Vibration Research, University of Southampton, Highfield, Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK (tgl@soton.ac.uk).

Research in an economic downturn poses extra challenges. Even at the best of times, the classical route from idea to successful product is often a long and difficult one, particularly if the criterion for success is based on wealth creation. However, other criteria are important, such as establishing a service or a pioneering dataset, or advancing and disseminating knowledge sufficient to support innovation in the years to come. The commercial benefits of much research often take years to appear, and require input from diverse strands. The foundations of such strands are often fundamental, adventurous, and it would have been difficult for Government at the time to persuade taxpayers of such long-term benefits. Tensions arise between four conflicting drivers: First, the need for Treasury to reassure taxpayers that tax revenue is invested wisely; Second, the need for Research Councils to balance the requirements of government (who are reassured if wealth creation from research occurs by the end of, say, a 3-year grant) with the recognition that the country needs fundamental and adventurous (high risk, high gain) research to engender innovation; Third, the need of academics to ensure that their response to financial downturn (and the resulting policies) enables them to spend more time on core research activities, not less (a real possibility if, in their field, the success rate of research proposals diminishes); Fourth, the needs of industry to remain financially viable when the monies available for research are significantly reduced. This paper explores these ideas by discussing three case studies of innovation involving bubble acoustics: one in biomedicine, one in ultrasonic cleaning, and one in sonar.

Introduction

'Research', in the context of this article, can be classed into four categories. The first two (product development and applied research) usually have identifiable routes for exploitation which, it is hoped, would benefit the public who generally pay for it. Such benefits might, for example, be provided in terms of products and processes for industry, healthcare, government, or tools and guidance for the monitoring, regulation and engineering of society. In an economic downturn, both product development and applied research benefit from the ease with which researchers, sponsors and government and media can explain the benefits of this tax spend to the public, and the ease with which the public can grasp those arguments. At the other extreme there are those projects which remain as basic research for many decades. The main output of such research is in the discovery of new knowledge. This output provides only a difficult argument to make to the public for use of tax revenues in an economic downturn. As such, when seemingly perpetual basic research themes are justified to the public in terms of the number of people trained or by pointing to example domestic products, the justification is denuded by omission of the most compelling argument, that of discovery, since the public can appreciate the gap filled by many others in taking, for example, particle physics discoveries into products in the home or hospital. Such exploitation paths suffer from the perception by non-scientists of a genealogical route for the exploitation of research, whereby (with the exception of a few famous figures) credit is given to the product development prior to delivery rather that to the more fundamental research of earlier workers. We may remember da Vinci, Mendel, Rayleigh, Watson and Crick, but behind every cathode ray oscilloscope and aircraft engine there are too many names to recall, and explanations of their contributions may require considerable insight and effort for the public and policy makers to grasp.

This article considers the fourth type of research project, which sits midway in the above list, where basic research is followed through to an identifiable product by a single research team. Such a route is not, like product development or applied research often are, based on existing products or techniques. As such, it can be a channel for the most groundbreaking innovation to reach the point of public service. Cases are here considered where this development is done by a single research team, for one important reason: where the route diverges to different teams, the connections can be lost. (e.g. as products appear through use of code written and passed on either informally or commercially, code which itself was based on groundbreaking equations by earlier workers; or when researchers fail to recollect every single comment, question, conversation and presentation which in retrospect was key to the solution). The fact that no clear genealogy exists for many end-products undermines a current drive to assess ‘research’ through its ‘impact’.

What we call ‘research’ has been subtly redefined in recent years. The definition used in the 2008 UK national assessment of the way core funding for research should be distributed as Universities compete with each other (the Research Assessment Exercise, RAE), was that research was “original investigation undertaken in order to gain knowledge and understanding” [1]. This did not differ significantly from the definition used in the 2001 RAE. However in 2009, for future assessment exercises (the so-called ‘Research Excellence Framework’) the definition of research was changed to “a process of investigation leading to new insights effectively shared” [2]. This change, which is aimed at emphasizing the benefits that research brings to markets, reflects the meteoric rise of the perception that good research has ‘impact’, a concept which encompasses the extent to which an item of research makes a positive difference outside the discipline in which it was conducted. Greater clarity of the meaning of this term, in the current global financial crisis, is perhaps illustrated by examples, wherein ‘impact’ can be delivered by creating new businesses, enabling wealth creation in current business, delivering the same level of healthcare more cost-effectively, or delivering major benefits to the ‘UK brand’ by, for example, enhancing UK performance in the London 2012 Olympics.

However, there are manifestly two types of impact. The first is ‘retrospective impact’. This is a respectable concept that can be attributed to those innovations which generated some proven benefit, where some current product, process or service can be credited in part to a recorded (and usually published) item some years earlier. The second type of impact is ‘prospective impact’. These are, in contrast, works of the imagination (given credibility only when they are placed in the context of track record of ‘retrospective impact’). In 2009 the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) introduced the mandatory requirement that grant applicants provide statements of ‘prospective impact’, which would be assessed when considering whether to fund a project. This requirement needs to be balanced to offset the already inbuilt advantage that product development has over more adventurous fundamental research. This advantage is that product development can not only produce a more concrete prospective impact statement, but it can more easily attract support (including matching funds) from the industries which would otherwise need to fund product development in its entirety. The methods for providing reviewers and sponsors with evidence of the merits for adventurous fundamental research projects are qualitatively different from these more concrete and quantifiable measures available to product development and applied research. Adventurous fundamental research should therefore be assessed differently to avoid the assessment being based upon their low scores in these concrete measures.

The encouragement for researchers to emphasize prospective impact when applying for research funding reduces the imagination needed by Government and public when the argument is made that those tax revenues spent on research have been wisely invested. However, the impact of fundamental research does not follow the simple genealogical lineage to which this model applies. We know from spectacular examples of retrospective impact (such as the 1859 publication [3] of the geologist Charles Darwin following his circumnavigation of the globe in 1831-6) that impact may take many years to become apparent, may still be ongoing, can be unpredictable, and often occurs in fields outside those of the original researcher (or, to put it another way, impact in one field often requires input from other disciplines). With today’s proliferation of information exchange, the researchers themselves may be unaware of the use made of their research, and the user be unaware of the original research that was key to the exploitation. If the wealth-creation event ever cites a source, it may cite an obvious applied paper, but the genius may be owed to an equation presented 100 years earlier and embedded in the commercial code used in the more recent applied paper. The emphasis on short-term impact places a driver against fundamental research and towards the product development that previously went on in industry. This model can be easy to sell to business and public, but without Faraday’s benchtop experiments or Maxwell’s equations, and contributions from many scientists and engineers whose names we would not recognize, how much of the equipment in a current intensive care ward would exist?

Not all topic areas for fundamental research are difficult to justify as constituting a wise spend of taxpayers’ money. This has led to the ring-fencing of large tracts of funding for specific topics. Currently UK Research Councils do this for: energy; living with environmental change; ageing (life long health & wellbeing); global uncertainty (security for all in a changing world); nanoscience through engineering to application; and the digital economy [4]. In moderation, this is a sensible way of ensuring that the public funds spent on research tackle major societal issues. However, it must be undertaken with the awareness that it reduces the funds available for other studies, and in an economic downturn this reduction can eradicate some centres for research in other topics. The argument that funding by topic places monetary support in the topics from which the ‘big solutions’ will come, is undermined by the fact that innovation frequently requires the cross-fertilization of other disciplines. Furthermore, failure to maintain critical competency in fundamental topics outside the favoured group not only prevents this cross-fertilization, but also reduces the ability to anticipate future crises. For example, early warnings of climate change came from an electrochemist (by training) in 1896 [5] and a steam engineer in 1935 [6], who stated that "By fuel combustion man has added about 150,000 million tons of carbon dioxide to the air during the past half century… approximately three quarters of this has remained in the atmosphere… the increase in mean temperature, due to the artificial production of carbon dioxide, is estimated to be at the rate of 0.003 ° C per year at the present time". The overwhelming argument for research funding should not be the ease with which the public can be convinced that the funds are well spent, or else product development and global crisis topics themselves will suffer in the long term by the loss of expertise in the wider topic field upon which, in the long term, both depend. The issue is on how much funding must be preserved for truly adventurous fundamental research. Since the survival of research groups depends of funding exceeding threshold values (at a minimum, that required to keep one staff member, although a critical mass of researchers represents a more realistic threshold size), reductions in the proportion of funding reaching research groups (i.e. after overheads are subtracted) will lead to group/departmental closures in an economic downturn in a way which would not occur in better economies. This is a particular problem when economic hardship for universities causes income generation by individual researchers to be a major feature in assessing redundancies. For individuals a clear survival response would be to move from basic research towards product development, and to try to compete in the favoured topic areas against established groups, some of which shape the calls for proposals. This reduces the time a researcher spends on core research in their expertise, and can increase the time spent to little effect writing unsuccessful proposals in areas in which they have less expertise and training. Persistent non-productivity will hasten the closure of research groups and departments. Once expertise is lost, the cost of restarting it is much greater than the year-on-year maintenance, and the economic savings in the interim must be offset against the loss of cross-fertilization to other disciplines, loss of education and training in the topic, and loss of the prescience of future needs. The loss of nuclear power expertise in the UK in the 1980s, and the current imperative for new build, provides one such example.

Hence the focused support for an impactful research programme must be balanced with enough support for academic freedom: the three high impact studies cited above [3-6] were all considered, to a greater or lesser extent, to be outside their main fields by the researchers in question, and indeed Callendar's research is recognized as having been a spare-time hobby [7]. There are no simple arguments to convince a public that tax funds have been wisely spent supporting a critical mass of research characterized by academic freedom. However, since such free research has less explicitly promised short-term impact, it can be conducted with reduced monitoring and control. If government accepts this, such adventurous fundamental research should require reduced overhead for administration. This is crucial: total UK expenditure by research councils in the UK has nearly doubled in the last ten years, but included in this is a very significant increase in overhead paid to universities by research councils. For example, the overhead required on the research proposal submitted by the author in the same week as this article was submitted (January 2010), on a contract employing a researcher at a salary (including pension and before tax) of £36,251 per anum, is £67,650; in 2005 it would have been £16,676 per anum. The increased overheads reflect the Full Economic Costs (FEC), which were introduced by UK Government in 2006 in response to the assessment that about a third of the costs universities attributed to research were not covered by research income, leaving a £2 billion "research deficit" in the sector [8]. Despite the extra income from FEC, the deficit remains around £2 billion. Whilst Universities are not obliged to charge FEC to industrial sponsors, the perception is that research proposals attracting less than 80% of FEC are loss-making and are therefore discouraged. The position is clearly not sustainable, as high overheads deter sponsors and reduce the money available to research (and reduce the number of grants that can be awarded), and yet the full costs of infrastructure and support services need to be covered or the deficit will increase. A reduction in the administrative tasks required by government policies would leave a greater proportion of funds in universities for core research.

This paper illustrates the processes of innovation by reporting on three studies, following them from the initial idea through to their current status through single research teams. Whilst all three identified some prospective impact, the bulk of the research time progressed without external financial support, and even after years of research that full impact is yet to be realised. Whilst all three resulted in devices, a large proportion of the research came in the form of equations. For such theory the public and policy makers are poorly equipped to verify claims that these were key to the development of the devices. Scepticism may not be the biggest problem: the audience may be open-minded, but the claims may be spurious, illustrating how difficult is the assessment of research by impact.

The three studies are linked by the fact that the technologies rely on nonlinear response of gas bubbles in liquids when driven by ultrasound. Such bubbles are probably the most potent naturally occurring acoustical entities in liquids, and are highly nonlinear when they pulsate in response to a driving sound field. The first example describes a passive acoustical sensor which is placed on the skin of a patient undergoing shock wave lithotripsy (SWL). The second example uses the nonlinear oscillations of bubbles to produce enhanced ultrasonic cleaning, with applications for hospitals, industry and defence, and domestic use. The third example is a sonar system designed to detect object in bubbly water, which lays down the foundation for a wealth of other detection technologies (e.g. of improvised explosive devices (IEDs).

A passive acoustic sensor for lithotripsy

During SWL, thousands of shock waves are directed into the patient at a rate of about one per second, in order to fragment kidney stones or reduce them to a size whereby they can subsequently be dissolved using drugs [9]. With current apparatus the clinician is ill-equipped to determine in-theatre whether the treatment has been successful, with the result that 30-50% of patients need to return for re-treatment, and an unknown number receive a greater exposure to shock waves than is necessary for stone fragmentation. The research project described here led to the development of a new passive acoustic sensor, which is placed by a nurse on the patient’s skin, and passively monitors the scattering and reverberation of the SWL pulse in the body [10]. In the clinical trials, the automated output from the device during treatment could correctly predict successful treatments 94.7% of the time, compared to the 36.8% per cent scored by the clinician in theatre using the best currently-available equipment [11], although statistics from current clinical trials on how use of the machine affects retreatment rates will be more meaningful.

Development of the device required theory, computational fluid dynamics (CFD) simulation, laboratory and human tests, and clinical trials with the associated issues of patient safety and confidentiality [12]. The research for this device began in the late 1980s and early 1990s, with Coleman and Leighton using the correlation of cavitation luminescence with passive acoustic emissions from a benchtop lithotripter, to infer that the passive acoustic emissions could be used to monitor the lithotripter performance [13, 14]. These unfunded studies were followed by more unfunded work, characterising the spatial resolution of the passive acoustic sensor and correlating it with cell lysis, luminescence and the sound field [15-20] and determining the extent to which the quantitative passive acoustic output correlated with (and so might be used as a proxy measurement for) other effects produced by cavitation (e.g. sonochemical effects, erosion etc.) [21].

However, to use these findings in a clinical device, the researchers would need to understand how the far field acoustic emissions (detected by a sensor placed on the patient's skin) were related to the interaction of the shock wave, tissue and stone in the body. Modelling techniques for such emissions at the time were not up to the task. By the early 1990s, the Gilmore model was usefully being used to predict the far field emissions of the lithotripter-induced collapse in an infinite body of fluid from a bubble which remained spherical at all times [22]. However, during lithotripsy the bubbles do not remain spherical at all times, and indeed are likely to undergo fragmentation and coalescence, their dynamics being affected by structures around it [23-29]. By the mid 1990s, Boundary Element Methods [30] and Arbitrary Lagrangian Eulerian simulations [31] had been used to simulate the collapse of a bubble to produce a liquid jet which passes through the cavity, but not the moment where the jet impacts the downstream bubble wall to generate the blast wave which would dominate the far field passive acoustic emissions. Therefore in the late 1990s, funds were sought from EPSRC for two PhD studentships (awarded in 2000), one to produce appropriate simulations [12, 32-36] and the other to conduct experimental work. This experimentation began by identifying the initial bubble size to be used as input in the simulations [37], and then progressed through prototype design in a successful collaboration with Guys and St Thomas' Health Trust (GSTT) and Precision Acoustics Ltd. (PAL) [38-44]. This was followed eventually by clinical trials in 2004, but the data for these could not be used, and the submitted papers were withdrawn before publication, because although the data were taken with formal ethical approval and in compliance with the guidelines in place at the time, these guidelines changed prior to publication. One year of further funding was applied for, and granted from EPSRC in 2005, such that successful clinical trials were published in 2008 [10]. During the research, the team contacted established lithotripter manufacturers for support and to discuss incorporating the technology into the sensor suites already sold with commercial lithotripters (featuring X-ray and active ultrasonic technology). However, the team could not gain support from established lithotripter manufacturers (perhaps related to the mature stage of lithotripsy as a medical procedure [9]), and so the decision was made to produce a stand-alone device instead for a few thousand pounds. Units have been sold in the UK and US. Some clinicians are currently exploring the extent to which the device might condense the 'patient pathway' [9, 45]. The patient pathway describes the route taken by the patient through the health-care services. Condensing this pathway (e.g. by reducing inaccurate diagnoses, ineffective treatments, waiting times, and the number of times that the patient needs to visit the hospital to see different people) was a key aspiration in the 2004 NHS improvement plan [46]. By determining within the first hundred or so shocks (i.e. before the inception of most adverse affects) whether the stone is of a type that will fragment during lithotripsy, or whether the patient needs instead to be sent for ureteroscopic stone removal, the passive sensor is an innovation aligned with this aspiration. The device was awarded the 2008 'Medical & Healthcare' award by 'The Engineer' [47]. In the years since the original correlation of the acoustical emissions with cavitation [13], that correlation has been used by several laboratories around the world to develop ingenious ways to exploit it to characterize responses as a result of lithotripsy [48-52], and analysis of these far field passive acoustic emissions in the frequency domain has also been explored to provide a potential diagnostic for the efficacy of lithotripsy shock waves [38, 40-43, 53]. Applications for dental ultrasound have been investigated [54]. This fundamental research has therefore stimulated research elsewhere and generated a product, but the time lag between the first research to the current date is nearly two decades, only four years of which received external funding.

Ultrasonic cleaning

The second project describes how products for ultrasonic cleaning are being developed from fundamental research undertaken by the author in collaboration with Dr Peter Birkin of the School of Chemistry at the University of Southampton. The collaboration began in the late 1990s and received EPSRC support from 1999 until 2006. Although the projects have led to current products, these were not identified until recently: the stated goal of the first seven years of the research was to address identified problems in technology by increased fundamental understanding, in the hope that this would lead to exploitable solution (as indeed it did). As an indication of how times have changed, whilst this vision was sufficient a decade ago to obtain funding, the more precise impact statements associated with development of clearly specified and patented products were in 2009 judged by EPSRC to be too close to fundamental research to warrant funding by the 'follow-on' scheme for which it was eligible.

The research began with parallel studies of high energy cavitation (bubble collapse) and low energy bubble shape oscillations. The high energy cavitational collapse can generate a range of effects, including luminescence, chemical and biological effects, and erosion, and these have been exploited for years not only in research laboratories, but also in the practical application of the ultrasonic cleaning baths. However characterisation of the cleaning performance of such baths was (and still is) rudimentary, industry favouring a check based on the insertion of domestic aluminium cooking foil into the bath to see whether the cavitation is capable of generating small erosion 'pits' and 'holes' within the foil. This has numerous disadvantages, the main one being that the effect on the foil may be very different from the effect on the object to be cleaned when it is inserted into the bath, because insertion of such an object can disturb the ultrasonic field which causes the cleaning [21]. Indeed, even insertion of the empty mesh tray (which is normally used to hold the object to be cleaned) into the bath can disturb the sound field sufficiently to compromise the cleaning of the any object that would be placed into the tray. The research began by investigating techniques to monitor cavitation of the type which occurs in cleaning baths [21]. This included a novel trial whereby the author invited proponents of different cavitation monitoring techniques to visit the UK National Physical Laboratory (NPL) where they would each be assigned a 2-day period in which to test the effectiveness of their favoured technique [21]. Erosive, chemical, acoustic, and luminescence techniques were tested. The results showed that, whilst all the users could get their own technique to work to their satisfaction in their own laboratory under controlled conditions, all techniques in some way performed less well when deployed in a strict 2-day time limit in an unfamiliar laboratory [21]. This study stimulated development work on a number of sensors, such that three of the collaborators (NPL, the University of Southampton, and the University of Belarus) are now able to provide, for sale, commercial sensors for cavitation detection. The study also provided a step in the development of a reference cavitation facility at NPL [55, 56]. An off-shoot of the technique was used in a collaborative experiment between the Institute of Cancer Research and the University of Southampton, to provide *in vitro* cross-calibration for monitoring equipment for tumour therapy by high intensity focused ultrasound [57].

The author, Dr Birkin, and their students developed a range of sensors for such cavitation [58, 67-69]. These sensors were then deployed to monitor their efficiency when transducers couple to vessels to generate cavitation [70-74], including examination of the cleaning that could be achieved with commercial ultrasonic cleaning baths and ultrasonic horns [75]. Studies were also undertaken on the bubble activity which leads to cleaning, such as bubble collapse and the formation of high-speed jets as bubbles involute during collapse [76, 77]. This combined experience led to the development of cleaning apparatus which is currently under discussion for commercialisation in a University of Southampton spin-out company.

The second aspect of bubble activity which was researched, and fed into the development of products for the spin-out company, was acoustically-generated surface wave activity on a bubble. This activity generally occurs at lower driving pressures than the cavitational activity discussed above, and so leads to mass flux in the liquid and at the surface, and shear which can be used to clean, but does not lead to erosion. Indeed the researchers developed a dual microsensor which could simultaneously monitor for mass flux and erosion, and so find the cleaning regimes when one, both, or neither could be generated [78]. This is particularly important for the cleaning of surfaces which must not be eroded (such as delicates surfaces, or surfaces where the generation of a crack would make decontamination more difficult the next time cleaning is attempted). The research covered the underlying theory for the stimulation of such waves which allowed the driving conditions to be tuned to generate this activity [79-83], the monitoring of such waves through acoustic [84-91], photographic and electrochemical [92-96] techniques. A side-study of this work indicated that the technique could greatly increase the efficiency of electrodeposition processes in industry [97].

This fundamental science behind the ultrasonic cleaning project received good research council support from 1999 to 2006, but then with focusing of research into particular themes and the economic downturn, applications were rejected to develop this fundamental research into wealth creation. These two strands of research into the high-energy and low-energy bubble activities which produce (respectively) strong cleaning, or cleaning without erosion, were utilised in a project sponsored by the UK Defence Science and Technology Laboratory, which developed a successful prototype cleaning device. The author and Dr Birkin are trying to raise support for a spin out company from the University of Southampton, and have started receiving product orders, but the project is critically short of funds: one of their two researchers has just been made redundant due to lack of funds, while the funds employing the other researcher are currently due to end in 3 more months.

A sonar that will penetrate oceanic bubble clouds

The third project is the development of a sonar system which can function in bubbly waters, where dolphins are able to echolocate but where the best currently-available man-made sonar cannot. Although gas bubbles in the ocean confound man-made sonar, some cetaceans must deal with bubbles as a result of their location (for example as occurs with those species restricted to coastal regions): others actively generate bubbles to aid their feeding. Indeed it was seeing video footage of this in 2003 which first inspired the suggestion [35, 98]. Data is scarce as to what extent, if any, cetaceans have exploited the acoustical effects of bubbles, or have undertaken tactics to compensate for their deleterious effects. The absence of data provides a fruitful opportunity for hypothesis. Having evolved over tens of millions of years to cope with the underwater acoustic environment, cetaceans may have developed extraordinary techniques from which we could learn [99-103]. This idea was developed through simulation [104-108], laboratory [109-113] and sea trials (with parallel studies to measure the ocean bubble population to use as input to the modelling [84, 85, 87-89, 114, 115]) to develop practical sonar technology for use in bubbly waters. The first (and only to date) sea trials were finally completed in February 2008, using internal funds and borrowed equipment, and successfully distinguished between bubbles (from ship wakes) and the seabed (which was being used as a target). The fundamental technology has also been proposed for use in the detection of improvised explosive devices (IEDs), detection of surveillance equipment, detection of combustion products and use with MRI [104, 111]. Despite over a dozen applications for research funding, no funding has ever been granted (the studentship, travel and equipment requirements were paid for by consultancy earnings on other projects by the investigators). The first IPR protection was filed in 2005 [104], but by when approval was given in 2009 to grant the patent [104] there were insufficient funds to invest in this. The work linked with other work on seabed acoustics [116-121]to generate proposed methods for monitoring the populations of climatologically significant methane bubbles in the seabed, which can also make the seabed unsuitable for civil engineering works [122], which in turn led to new hydrophone calibration techniques (developed in collaboration with NPL) [123]. The background work on methods to monitor oceanic bubble populations led to measurements of the interactions between atmosphere and oceans, particularly in the transfer of greenhouse gases between them [124]; and to sensors for use by the ceramics and neutron generation industries [125, 126].

Conclusions

Reference [127] surveys the time it takes from the initial innovation to wealth creation through innovation. It records a one-year study into the economic benefits of the UK's public and charitable investment in medical research. It found the benefits to be high: a £1.00 investment in public/charitable cardiovascular disease (CVD) research produced a stream of benefits equivalent to earning £0.39 per year *in perpetuity*. However, it also records that the time lag between research expenditure and eventual health benefits is around 17 years: it infers "a mean lag between research and impact for CVD treatments of between 10 and 25 years, with a central estimate of 17 years."

The three projects (lithotripsy; cleaning; TWIPS) have so far progressed for many years (19;10;6 years respectively) of which only a small proportion was funded (4;7;0 years respectively), the remainder relying on the investigators supporting the work themselves through unpaid overtime or by spending (on student stipends, equipment and travel) funds they earned through consultancy work. Hence all the projects were either wholly or significantly dependent on unfunded work by the investigators and students, maintaining the momentum for years at a time when no funding could be obtained. The three projects required some 100 papers of fundamental research, noting that the work that is closer to market has been held back from publication to protect IPR. These publications detail how much of the work for the eventual project took place in other topic areas. The three projects have between them produced two commercial products (one winning a national award), with several more in development from the cleaning project.

Acknowledgements

The author is very grateful to Prof. P. A. Nelson for discussion on the principle of funding innovation, and wishes to thanks the following people who collaborated on the two projects discussed here. For passive acoustic sensor for lithotripsy: A. J. Coleman, F. Fedele, C.

McCarthy, S. Ryves, A. M. Hurrell, A. De Stefano, C. K. Turangan, A. R. Jamaluddin, G. J. Ball,; for the sonar project, D C Finfer, and G. H. Cho. The author is very grateful to P. R. White for assistance with both projects. The author is extremely grateful to Dr Peter Birkin for the long standing collaboration in the ultrasonic cleaning project, and for their joint students who has undertaken subprojects in that work: J. Power, Y. Watson, D. Offin, C. Vian, and H. Hirsimaki.

REFERENCES

[1] **Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), the Scottish Funding Council (SFC), the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW) and the Department for Employment and Learning, Northern Ireland (DEL).** RAE 03/2005 - RAE2008: Guidance on submissions. June 2005.

[2] **Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), the Scottish Funding Council (SFC), the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW) and the Department for Employment and Learning, Northern Ireland (DEL).** REF 2009/38 Research Excellence Framework Second consultation on the assessment and funding of research/ September 2009.

[3] **Darwin, C.** On the origin of species by means of natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life. (John Murray publisher) 1859.

[4] **Engineering and physical Sciences Research Council,** EPSRC Delivery Plan 2008/09 to 2010/11 (Updated for 2009/10) March 2009.

[5] **Arrhenius S**, On the influence of carbonic acid in the air upon the temperature of the ground, *Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science Series 5*, **41**, pp. 237-276, 1896.

[6] **Callendar G S**, The artificial production of carbon dioxide and its influence on temperature, *Quarterly Journal Royal Meteorological Society* **64**, pp. 223–240, 1938.

[7] Obituary, Mr G. S. Callendar, *Quarterly Journal Royal Meteorological Society* **91**, pp. 112, 1965.

[8] **Newman**, **M**, FEC scrutinised as deficit lingers, *Times Higher Education*, 12 November 2009

[9] **Leighton T G** and **Cleveland R O**, Lithotripsy, *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part H: Journal of Engineering in Medicine,* **224** (in press, DOI 10.1243/09544119JEIM588) 2010

[10] **Leighton T G, Fedele F, Coleman AJ, McCarthy C, Ryves S, Hurrell A M, De Stefano A** and **White P R**, A device for monitoring the efficacy of ESWL using passive acoustic emissions, *Ultrasound in Medicine and Biology*, **34**(10), pp. 1651-1665, 2008.

[11] **Leighton T G, Fedele F, Coleman A J, McCarthy C, Ryves S, Hurrell A M, De Stefano A** and **White P R,** Clinical Studies of Real-Time Monitoring of Lithotripter Performance Using Passive Acoustic Sensors, In Proc. 2nd International Urolithiasis Research Symposium (edited by A. P. Evan, J. E. Lingeman, J. A. McAteer and J. C. Williams Jr.), American Institute of Physics, pp. 256-277, 2008.

[12] **Leighton T G, Fedele F, Coleman A, McCarthy C, Jamaluddin A R, Turangan C K, Ball G, Ryves S, Hurrell A, de Stefano A** and **White P R**. The development of a passive acoustic device for monitoring the effectiveness of shockwave lithotripsy in real time, *Hydroacoustics*, **11**, pp. 159-180, 2008.

[13] **Coleman A J, Choi M J, Saunders J E** and **Leighton T G**, Acoustic emission and sonoluminescence due to cavitation at the beam focus of an electrohydraulic shock wave lithotripter, *Ultrasound in Medicine and Biology*, **18**, pp. 267-281, 1992.

[14] **Leighton T G**, *The Acoustic Bubble*, Academic Press, 1994.

[15] **Coleman A J, Whitlock M, Leighton T G** and **Saunders J E**, The spatial distribution of cavitation induced acoustic emission, sonoluminescence and cell lysis in the field of a shock wave lithotripter, *Physics in Medicine and Biology*, **38**, pp. 1545-1560, 1993.
[16] **Pickworth M J W, Dendy P P, Twentyman P R** and **Leighton T G**, Studies of the cavitational effects of clinical ultrasound by sonoluminescence: 4. The effect of therapeutic ultrasound on cells in monolayer culture in a standing wave field, *Physics in Medicine and Biology*, **34** (11), pp. 1553-1560, 1989.
[17] **Leighton T G, Pickworth M J W, Walton A J** and **Dendy P P**, Studies of the cavitational effects of clinical ultrasound by sonoluminescence: 1. Correlation of sonoluminescence with the standing-wave pattern in an acoustic field produced by a therapeutic unit, *Physics in Medicine and Biology*, **33** (11), pp. 1239-1248, 1988.
[18] **Pickworth M J W, Dendy P P, Leighton T G** and **Walton A J**, Studies of the cavitational effects of clinical ultrasound by sonoluminescence: 2. Thresholds for sonoluminescence from a therapeutic ultrasound beam and the effect of temperature and duty cycle, *Physics in Medicine and Biology*, **33** (11), pp. 1249-1260, 1988.
[19] **Pickworth M J W, Dendy P P, Leighton T G, Worpe E** and **Chivers R C**, Studies of the cavitational effects of clinical ultrasound by sonoluminescence. 3: Cavitation from pulses a few microseconds in length, *Physics in Medicine and Biology*, **34** (9), pp. 1139-1151, 1989.
[20] **Leighton T G, Pickworth M J W, Tudor J** and **Dendy P P**, Studies of the cavitational effects of clinical ultrasound by sonoluminescence: 5. Search for sonoluminescence *in vivo* in the human cheek, *Ultrasonics*, **28**, pp. 181-184, 1990.
[21] **Leighton T G, Birkin P R, Hodnett M, Zeqiri B, Power J F, Price G J, Mason T, Plattes M, Dezhkunov N** and **Coleman A J,** Characterisation Of Measures Of Reference Acoustic Cavitation (COMORAC): An experimental feasibility trial, in: Bubble and Particle Dynamics in Acoustic Fields: Modern Trends and Applications (A. A. Doinikov, editor) (Research Signpost, Kerala), pp. 37-94, 2005
[22] **Church C C**, A theoretial study of cavitation generated by an extracorporeal shock wave lithotripter. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **86**, pp. 215–227, 1989.
[23] **Leighton T G, White P R** and **Marsden M A**, Applications of one-dimensional bubbles to lithotripsy, and to diver response to low frequency sound, *Acta Acustica*, **3**, pp. 517-529, 1995.
[24] **Leighton T G, White P R** and **Marsden M A**, The one-dimensional bubble: An unusual oscillator, with applications to human bioeffects of underwater sound, *European Journal of Physics*, **16**, pp. 275-281, 1995.
[25] **Leighton T G, Ho W-L** and **Flaxman R**, Sonoluminescence from the unstable collapse of a conical bubble. *Ultrasonics*, **35**, pp. 399-405, 1997.
[26] **Leighton T G, Phelps A D, Cox B T** and **Ho W L**, Theory and preliminary measurements of the Rayleigh-like collapse of a conical bubble. *Acta Acustica*, **84**(6), pp. 1014-1024, 1998.
[27] **Leighton T G, Cox B T** and **Phelps A D**, The Rayleigh-like collapse of a conical bubble, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, **107**(1), pp. 130-142, 2000.
[28] **Zhong P, Zhou Y** and **Zhu S**, Dynamics of bubble oscillations in constrained media and mechanisms of vessel rupture in SWL. *Ultrasound Med. Biol.* **27**, pp. 119–134, 2001.
[29] **Sassaroli E** and **Hynynen K**, Cavitation threshold of microbubbles in gel tunnels by focused ultrasound. *Ultrasound Med. Biol.* **33**(10), pp. 1651–1660, 2007.
[30] **Blake, J R, Hooton, M C, Robinson, P B** and **Tong R P**, 1997 Collapsing cavities, toroidal bubbles and jet impact. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A* **355**, pp. 537–550, 1997.

[31] **Ding Z** and **Gracewski S M,** The behaviour of a gas cavity impacted by a weak or strong shock wave, *J. Fluid Mech.* **309**, pp. 183–209, 1996.
[32] **Ball G J, Howell B, Leighton T G** and **Schofield M,** Shock-induced collapse of a cylindrical air cavity in water: a Free-Lagrange simulation, *Shock Waves* **10**, pp. 265-276, 2000.
[33] **Jamaluddin A R, Ball G J and Leighton T G,** Free-Lagrange simulations of shock/bubble interaction in shock wave lithotripsy, In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Computational Fluid Dynamics, ICCFD*, Sydney, Australia, pp 541-546, 2002.
[34] **Jamaluddin A R, Ball G J** and **Leighton T G**. Free-Lagrange simulations of shock/bubble interaction in shock wave lithotripsy, In *Proceedings of the 24th International Symposium on Shock Waves*, Beijing, China, pp. 1211-1216, 2004.
[35] **Leighton T G**, From seas to surgeries, from babbling brooks to baby scans: The acoustics of gas bubbles in liquids', *International Journal of Modern Physics B,* **18**(25), pp. 3267-3314, 2004.
[36] **Turangan C K, Jamaluddin A R, Ball G J** and **Leighton T G**, Free-Lagrange simulations of the expansion and jetting collapse of air bubbles in water, *J. Fluid Mech*. **598**, pp. 1-25, 2008.
[37] **Cunningham K B, Coleman A, Leighton T G** and **White P R,** Characterising in vivo acoustic cavitation during lithotripsy with time-frequency methods, *Acoustics Bulletin* **26**(5), pp. 10-16, 2001.
[38] **Leighton T G, Coleman AJ, Fedele F** and **White P R**, A passive acoustic system for evaluating the in vivo performance of extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy, *UK Patent Application No. 0319863.7,* 2003.
[39] **Fedele F, Coleman A J** and **Leighton T G**, Use of a cylindrical PVdF hydrophone in a study of cavitation adjacent to stone phantoms during extracorporeal shockwave lithotripsy, In *Proc of the 9th Annual National Conference of the Institute of Physics and Engineering in Medicine*, (IPEM, Bath) p. 66, 2003
[40] **Fedele F, Coleman A J, Leighton T G, White P R** and **Hurrell A M**, A new sensor for detecting and characterising acoustic cavitation in vivo during ESWL, *Acoustics Bulletin* **29**, pp. 34-39, 2004.
[41] **Fedele F, Coleman A J, Leighton T G, White P R** and **Hurrell A M**, Development of a new diagnostic sensor for Extra-corporeal Shock-Wave Lithotripsy, In *Proceedings of the First Conference in Advanced Metrology for Ultrasound in Medicine*, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **1**, 134-139, 2004.
[42] **Fedele F, Coleman A J, Leighton T G, White P R** and **Hurrell A M,** A new sensor for detecting and characterising acoustic cavitation in vivo during ESWL, In *Proceedings of the Institute of Acoustics*, **26**(1), pp. 422-432, 2004.
[43] **Fedele F, Coleman A J ,Leighton T G, White P R** and **Hurrell A M.** Development of a new diagnostic device for Extracorporeal Shock-Wave Lithotripsy, In *Proceedings of the X Mediterranean Conference on Medical and Biological Engineering "Health in the Information Society"*, 31 July - 5 August 2004. IFMBE Proceedings **6**, CD proceedings paper no.54 (4 pages), 2004.
[44] **Coleman A C, Fedele F** and **Leighton T G**, System and method for monitoring lithotripsy, US Patent application (filed 31 March 2009).
[45] **Smith N C, Fedele F, Ryves S, Leighton T G, Coleman A J** and **Thomas K,** The 'Smart Stethoscope': predicting the outcome of lithotripsy, *BJU International* (Formerly: *British Journal of Urology*) **103**(4), pp. 32 (Abstract) , 2009.

[46] **UK Department of Health**, The NHS improvement plan: putting people at the heart of public services, *Publication Cm 6268, 24 June 2004*, pp. 80 Stationery Office, London, 2004.
[47] **Lee, A.** Sound effects, *The Engineer* (3rd October 2008), pp. 17-18, 2008.
[48] **Zhong P, Cioanta I, Cocks F H** and **Preminger G M**, Inertial cavitation and associated acoustic emission produced during electrohydraulic shock wave lithotripsy, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.***101**(1), pp. 2940 –2950, 1997.
[49] **Cleveland R O, Sapozhnikov O A, Bailey M R** and **Crum L A,** A dual passive cavitation detector for localized detection of lithotripsy-induced cavitation *in vitro*, J. Acoust. Soc. Am.**107**(3), pp. 1745–1758, 2000.
[50] **Matula T J, Hilmo P R, Bailey M R** and **Crum LA,** In vitro sonoluminescence and sonochemistry studies with an electrohydraulic shockwave lithotripter, *Ultrasound Med. Biol.***28**(9), pp. 1199 –1207, 2002.
[51] **Bailey M R, Pishchalnikov Y A, Sapozhnikov O A, Cleveland R O, McAteer J A, Miller N A, Pishchalnikova I V, Connors B A, Crum L A** and **Evan A P**, Cavitation detection during shock-wave lithotripsy, *Ultrasound Med. Biol.* **31**(9), pp. 1245–1256, 2005.
[52] **Xu Z, Hall T L, Fowlkes J B** and **Cain C A**, Effects of acoustic parameters on bubble cloud dynamics in ultrasound tissue erosion (histotripsy), *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **122**(1), pp. 229 –236, 2007.
[53] **Owen N R, Bailey M R, Crum L A, Sapozhnikov O A** and **Trusov L A**, The use of resonant scattering to identify stone fracture in shock wave lithotripsy. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **121**, pp. EL41–EL46, 2007.
[54] **O'Leary R, Sved A M, Davies E H, Leighton T G, Wilson M** and **Kieser J B**, The bactericidal effects of dental ultrasound on *Actinobacillus actinomycetemcomitans* and *Porphyromonas gingivalis* - An *in vitro* investigation. *Journal of Clinical Periodonol.* **24**, 432-439, 1997.
[55] **Zeqiri B, Gelat P N, Hodnett M** and **Lee N D.** A novel sensor for monitoring acoustic cavitation. Part I: Concept, theory, and prototype development. *IEEE Transactions on Ultrasonics, Ferroelectrics, and Frequency Control*, **50**(10), pp. 1342-1350, 2003.
[56] **Hodnett M and Zeqiri B.** Toward a reference ultrasonic cavitation vessel: Part 2 - Investigating the spatial variation and acoustic pressure threshold of inertial cavitation in a 25 kHz ultrasound field. *IEEE Transactions on Ultrasonics, Ferroelectrics, and Frequency Control,* **55**(8), pp. 1809-1822, 2008.
[57] **McLaughlan J, Rivens I, ter Haar G, Shaw A, Leighton T G, Humphrey V F, Birkin, P R** and **Vian C.** The design and implementation of a passive cavitation detection system for use with ex vivo tissue, *Therapeutic Ultrasound: 5th International Symposium on Therapeutic Ultrasound*, **829**, pp. 338-342, 2006.
[58] **Birkin P R, Leighton T G, Watson Y E** and **Power J F**. Acoustoelectrochemistry. *Acoustics Bulletin* **26**(5), pp. 24-37, 2001.
[59] **Leighton T G, Farhat M, Field J E** and **Avellan F**, Cavitation luminescence from flow over a hydrofoil in a cavitation tunnel, *J. Fluid Mech.*, **480**, pp. 43-60, 2003.
[60] **Offin D G, Birkin P R, Leighton T G** and **Joseph P F.** Acoustoelectrochemistry: the application of sound to electrochemical processes, *Proceedings of the Institute of Acoustics,* **28**(1), pp. 821-829, 2006.
[61] **Vian, C.J.B., Birkin, P.R., Leighton, T.G., Zeqiri, B. and Hodnett, M.** Using surface erosion of an electrode as a method to map and characterise cavitation, *Proceedings of the Institute of Acoustics,* **28**(1), pp. 830-840, 2006.

[62] **Birkin P R, Offin D** and **Leighton T G,** Cavitation, shockwaves and electrochemistry - An experimental and theoretical approach to a complex environment. *Proceedings of the 19th International Congress on Acoustics* (Madrid 2007), Paper ULT-12-002, pp. 1-6, 2007.
[63] **Birkin P R, Power J F** and **Leighton T G**. Electrochemical evidence of H• produced by ultrasound. *J. Chem. Soc. Chemical Communications*, **21**, pp. 2230-2231, 2001.
[64] **Birkin P R, Power J F, Leighton T G** and **Vincotte A M L**. Cathodic electrochemical detection of sonochemical radical products, *Analytical Chemistry*, **74**, 2584-2590, 2002.
[65] **Birkin P R, Power J F, Abdelsalam M E** and **Leighton T G**. Electrochemical, luminescent and photographic characterisation of cavitation. *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry,* **10**, pp. 203-208, 2003.
[66] **Birkin P R, Offin DG** and **Leighton T G**. The study of surface processes under electrochemical control in the presence of inertial cavitation. *Wear*, **258**/1-4, pp. 623-628, 2004.
[67] **Birkin P R, Offin DG, Joseph PF** and **Leighton T G.** Cavitation, shock waves and the invasive nature of sonoelectrochemistry, *Journal of Physical Chemistry B,* **109,** pp. 16997-17005, 2005.
[68] **Leighton T G**, Transient excitation of insonated bubbles, *Ultrasonics*, **27**(1), pp. 50-53, 1989.
[69] **Leighton T G, Walton A J** and **Field J E**, High-speed photography of transient excitation, *Ultrasonics*, **27**, pp. 370-373, 1989.
[70] **Birkin P R, Leighton T G, Power J F, Simpson M D, Vincotte A M L** and **PF Joseph**. Experimental and theoretical characterisation of sonochemical cells. Part 1: Cylindrical reactors and their use to calculate speed of sound. *J. Phys. Chem .A*, **107**, pp. 306-320, 2003.
[71] **Leighton T G, White P R, Morfey CL, Clarke J W L, Heald G J, Dumbrell H A** and **Holland K R**, The effect of reverberation on the damping of bubbles. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, **112**(4), pp. 1366-1376, 2002.
[72] **Birkin P R, Power J F, Vincotte A M L** and **Leighton T G**. A 1 kHz resolution frequency study of a variety of sonochemical processes. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, **5**, pp. 4170-4174, 2003.
[73] **Vian C J B, Birkin P R and Leighton T G,** Opto-isolation of electrochemical systems in cavitation environments, *Analytical Chemistry*, **81**, pp. 5064-5069, 2009.
[74] **Leighton T G**, Bubble population phenomena in acoustic cavitation, *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry*, **2**, pp. S123-136, 1995.
[75] **Birkin P R, Offin DG** and **Leighton T G.** Experimental and theoretical characterisation of sonochemical cells - Part 2 Cell disruptors (Ultrasonic horns) and cavity cluster collapse, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, **7**, pp. 530–537, 2005.
[76] **Birkin, P.R., Hirsimaki, H., Frey, J.G. and Leighton, T.G.** Mass transfer enhancement by laser induced cavitation, *Electrochemistry Communications*, 8(10), pp. 1603-1609, 2006.
[77] **Hirsimiki H M, Birkin P R, Frey J G** and **Leighton T G.** The laser-induced formation of plasma bubbles in water - electrochemical measurements, *Proceedings of the Institute of Acoustics*, **28**(1), pp. 876-884, 2006.
[78] **Birkin P R, Offin DG** and **Leighton T G**. Electrochemical measurements of the effects of inertial acoustic cavitation by means of a novel dual microelectrode. *Electrochemistry Communications*, **6**(11), pp. 1174-1179, 2004.
[79] **Maksimov A O** and **Leighton T G**, Transient processes near the threshold of acoustically driven bubble shape oscillations, *Acta Acustica* **87**(3), pp. 322-332, 2001.

[80] **Maksimov A, Leighton T G** and **Sosedko E V**, Nonlinear Transient Bubble Oscillations. In: *Nonlinear Acoustics at the Beginning of the 21st Century* (Proceedings of the 16th International Symposium on Nonlinear Acoustics), edited by O.V. Rudenko and O.A. Sapozhnikov (Faculty of Physics, MSU, Moscow, 2002) vol. 2, pp. 987-990, 2002.

[81] **Maksimov A O, Leighton T G** and **Birkin P R**. Dynamics of a tethered bubble. *Proceedings of 17th International Symposium on Nonlinear Acoustics* (Pennsylvania, USA) *18-22 July 2005*, pp. 512-515, 2005.

[82] **Maksimov A, Winkels K, Birkin P R** and **Leighton T G**, Hopf Bifurcation in Acoustically Excited Faraday Ripples on a Bubble Wall. In: *Nonlinear Acoustics: Fundamentals and Applications* (*Proceedings of the 18th International Symposium on Nonlinear Acoustics*), (7 – 10 July 2008, Stockholm, Sweden) edited by B. O. Enflo, C. M. Hedberg and L. Kari (AIP Conference Proceedings, Melville, New York, 2008), pp. 229-232, 2008.

[83] **Maksimov A O, Leighton T G** and **Birkin P R**, Theoretical and experimental studies of Faraday waves on the surfaces of bubbles, *Physics Letters A*, **372**(18), pp. 3210-3216, 2008.

[84] **Phelps A D** and **Leighton T G**, High resolution bubble sizing through detection of the subharmonic response with a two frequency excitation technique, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, **99**, pp. 1985-1992, 1996.

[85] **Leighton T G, Phelps A D, Ramble D G** and **Sharpe D A**, Comparison of the abilities of eight acoustic techniques to detect and size a single bubble, *Ultrasonics*, **34**, pp. 661-667, 1996.

[86] **Phelps A D** and **Leighton T G**, The subharmonic oscillations and combination-frequency emissions from a resonant bubble: their properties and generation mechanisms, *Acta Acustica*, **83**, pp. 59-66, 1997.

[87] **Phelps A D, Ramble D G** and **Leighton T G**, The use of a combination frequency technique to measure the surf zone bubble population, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, **101**(4), pp. 1981-1989, 1997.

[88] **Leighton T G, Ramble D G** and **Phelps A D**, The detection of tethered and rising bubbles using multiple acoustic techniques, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, **101**(5), pp. 2626-2635, 1997.

[89] **Phelps A D** and **Leighton T G**, Oceanic bubble population measurements using a buoy-deployed combination frequency technique. *IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering*, **23**(4), pp. 400-410, 1998.

[90] **Leighton T G, Ramble D G**, **Phelps A D, Morfey C L** and **Harris P P**, Acoustic detection of gas bubbles in a pipe, *Acta Acustica*, **84**, pp. 801-814, 1998.

[91] **Ramble D G, Phelps A D** and **Leighton T G**, On the relation between surface waves on a bubble and the subharmonic combination-frequency emission, *Acta Acustica*, **84**(5), pp. 986-988, 1998.

[92] **Birkin P R, Leighton T G and Watson Y E**, The use of Acoustoelectrochemistry to investigate bubble phenomena – Rectified diffusion. Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on "Applications of Power Ultrasound in Physical and Chemical Processing (Beasancon), pp. 101-106, 2003.

[93] **Birkin P R, Watson Y E** and **Leighton T G**. Efficient mass transfer from an acoustically oscillated gas bubble. *J. Chem. Soc. Chemical Communications*, **24**, pp. 2650-2651, 2001.

[94] **Birkin P R, Watson Y E, Leighton T G** and **Smith K L**. Electrochemical detection of Faraday waves on the surface of a gas bubble. *Langmuir Surfaces and Colloids*, **18**, pp. 2135-2140, 2002.
[95] **Watson Y E, Birkin P R** and **Leighton T G**. Electrochemical detection of bubble oscillation. *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry,* **10**, pp. 65-69, 2003.
[96] **Birkin P R, Leighton T G** and **Watson Y E.** The use of Acoustoelectrochemisty to investigate rectified diffusion. *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry,* **11** (3-4), pp. 217-221, 2004.
[97] **Birkin P R, Offin DG** and **Leighton T G**. Electrodeposition of copper in the presence of an acoustically excited gas bubble. *Electrochemistry Communications,* **9** (5), pp. 1062–1068, 2007.
[98] **Leighton T G**, Nonlinear Bubble Dynamics And The Effects On Propagation Through Near-Surface Bubble Layers, In *High-Frequency Ocean Acoustics*, Eds. M.B. Porter, M. Siderius, and W. Kuperman, (American Institute of Physics Melville, New York) *AIP Conference Proceedings* **728**, pp. 180-193, 2004.
[99] **Leighton T G, Richards S D** and **White P R,** Trapped within a 'wall of sound': A possible mechanism for the bubble nets of humpback whales, *Acoustics Bulletin* **29**, pp. 24-29, 2004.
[100] **Leighton T G, Finfer D C, Grover E J** and **White P R,** An acoustical hypothesis for the spiral bubble nets of humpback whales, and the implications for whale feeding, *Acoustics Bulletin* **32**(1), 17-21, 2007.
[101] **Leighton T G, Finfer D C, Grover E** and **White P R,** Spiral bubble nets of humpback whales: an acoustic mechanism, In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Underwater Acoustic Measurements, Technologies and Results,* J.S. Papadakis and L. Bjorno, eds. (Heraklion, Crete) pp. 583-588, 2007.
[102] **Leighton T G, Finfer D C** and **White P R**, Cavitation and cetacean, In *Proceedings of the 19th International Congress of Acoustics* (Madrid) Paper PL003, pp. 1-31, 2007.
[103] **Leighton T G, Finfer D C** and **White P R**, Cavitation and cetacean, *Revista de Acústica,* **38**(3-4), pp. 37-81, 2007.
[104] **Clarke, J W L and Leighton T G.** A method for estimating time-dependent acoustic cross-sections of bubbles and bubble clouds prior to the steady state, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America,* **107**(4), pp. 1922-1929, 2000.
[105] **Leighton T G, White P R** and **Finfer D C**, Contrast enhancement between linear and nonlinear scatterers Patent 06755621.7 - 2220 (2008); claiming priority from International patent application number PCT/GB2006/002335 (filed 26 June 2006); claiming priority from UK patent application GB 0513031.5, University of Southampton (2005) GB/25.06.05 GBA 0513031, 2005.
[106] **Leighton T G, White P R, Finfer D C** and **Richards S D,** Cetacean acoustics in bubbly water, In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Underwater Acoustic Measurements, Technologies and Results,* J.S. Papadakis and L. Bjorno, eds. (Crete), pp. 891-898, 2005.
[107] **Leighton T G, White P R** and **Finfer D C**, Bubble acoustics in shallow water: possible applications in Nature, In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Boundary influences in high frequency, shallow water acoustics* (Bath) pp. 433-440, 2005.
[108] **Leighton T G, Finfer D C** and **White P R**, Bubble acoustics: What can we learn from cetaceans about contrast enhancement? In *Proc. 2005 IEEE International Ultrasonics Symposium* (Rotterdam) pp. 964-973, 2005.
[109] **Leighton T G, Finfer D C** and **White P R**, Sonar which penetrates bubble clouds, In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Underwater Acoustic*

Measurements, Technologies and Results, J.S. Papadakis and L. Bjorno, eds (Heraklion, Crete) pp. 555-562, 2007.

[110] **Leighton T G, Finfer D C** and **White P R,** Experimental evidence for enhanced target detection by sonar in bubbly water, *Hydroacoustics*, **11**, pp. 181-202, 2008.

[111] **Leighton T G, White P R** and **Finfer D C,** Hypotheses regarding exploitation of bubble acoustics by cetaceans, In *Proceedings of the 9th European Conference on Underwater Acoustics*, (29 June – 4 July 2008, Paris, France) (edited by M. E. Zakharia, D. Cassereau and F. Luppé) pp. 77-82, 2008.

[112] **Leighton T G, Finfer D C** and **White P R**, Two hypotheses about cetacean acoustics in bubbly water, In *Bio-acoustics 2009 (Proceedings of the Institute of Acoustics Fifth Conference on Bio-Acoustics), Proceedings of the Institute of Acoustics,* **31**(1), pp. 119-128, 2009.

[113] **Leighton T G, White P R** and **Finfer D C**, Hypotheses on the acoustics of whales, dolphins and porpoises in bubbly water, In *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Underwater Acoustic Measurements, Technologies and Results,* J.S. Papadakis and L. Bjorno, eds. (21-16 June 2009, Nafplion, Greece), pp. 3-14, 2009.

[114] **Leighton T G, White P R** and **Schneider M F**, The detection and dimension of bubble entrainment and comminution, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, **103**(4), pp. 1825-183, 1998.

[115] **Leighton T G, Meers S D** and **White P R**, Propagation through nonlinear time-dependent bubble clouds, and the estimation of bubble populations from measured acoustic characteristics. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A,* **460**(2049), pp. 2521-2550, 2004.

[116] **Robb G B N, Best A I, Dix J K, Bull J, Leighton T G** and **White P R.** The frequency-dependence of compressional wave velocity and attenuation coefficient in marine sediment. *J. Acoustical Society of America* 120(5), pp. 2526-2537, 2006.

[117] **Bull J M, Gutowski M, Dix J K, Henstock T J, Hogarth P, Leighton T G** and **White P R.** Design of a 3D Chirp sub-bottom imaging system. *Mar. Geophys. Res.*, **26**, pp. 157-169, 2005.

[118] **Leighton T G,** Theory for acoustic propagation in marine sediment containing gas bubbles which may pulsate in a non-stationary nonlinear manner, *Geophysical Research Letters,* **34**, pp. L17607, 2007.

[119] **Robb G B N, Best A I, Dix J K, White P R, Leighton T G, Bull J M** and **Harris A.** The measurement of the in situ compressional wave properties of marine sediments, *IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering,* **32**(2), pp. 484-496, 2007

[120] **Gutowski Gutowski M, Bull K M, Dix J K, Henstock T J, Hogarth P, Hiller T, Leighton T G** and **White P R.** Three-dimensional high-resolution acoustic imaging of the sub-seabed, *Applied Acoustics*, **69**(5), pp. 412-421, 2008.

[121] **Leighton T G** and **Evans R C**, The detection by sonar of difficult targets (including centimetre-scale plastic objects and optical fibres) buried in saturated sediment, *Applied Acoustics* **69**(5), pp. 438-463, 2008

[122] **Leighton T G** and **Robb, G B N.** Preliminary mapping of void fractions and sound speeds in gassy marine sediments from subbottom profiles, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America,* **124**(5), pp. EL313-EL320, 2008.

[123] **Robb G B N, Robinson S P, Theobald P D, Hayman G, Humphrey V F, Leighton T G, Wang L S, Dix J K** and **Best A I,** Absolute calibration of hydrophones immersed in sandy sediment, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America,* **125**(5), pp. 2918-2927, 2009.

[124] **Brooks I M, Yelland M J, Upstill-Goddard R C, Nightingale P D, Archer S, D'Asaro E, Beale R, Beatty C, Blomquist B,** *et al.* Physical Exchanges at the Air–Sea Interface: UK-SOLAS Field Measurements, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society,* **90**, pp. 629-644, 2009.
[125] **Yim G-T** and **Leighton T G,** Real-time on-line monitoring of ceramic "slip" in pottery pipe-lines using ultrasound, *Ultrasonics,* **50**, pp. 60-67, 2010.
[126] **Ainslie M A and Leighton T G,** Near resonant bubble acoustic cross-section corrections, including examples from oceanography, volcanology, and biomedical ultrasound, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, **126**(5), pp. 2163-2175, 2009.
[127] **Health Economics Research Group, Office of Health Economics, RAND Europe.** Medical Research: What's it worth? Estimating the economic benefits from medical research in the UK. London: UK Evaluation Forum; 2008.