Dear Editor,

The present letter is to complain about a recent article in the RECORDER that was written by Gilles Lambaré from the Centre de Géophysique de Fontainebleau in France (GEOPHY).

The article, entitled "Stereotomography:Past, present and future", published in the April issue, presents an old geophysical problem - say the inverse signal matrix - studied by GEOPHY as a new and major contribution to the Geophysics field, but nothing can be so wrong, as I explain here.

Stereotomography is a term I invented in 1984 and used later in a copyrighted and published article for describing a geostatistical method pinpointing the rock mass discontinuities. I designed it between 1982 and 1984 with the help of my friend and colleague Dr Philippe G. Dor, who wrote our Basic software for it at the Universidad de Guanajuato (México) in Spring 1982.

Since then our article, published by Engineering Geology (Dec. 1984, 20(4): 311-324), has been registered by many earth science indices: GeoRef, Science Citation Index, ScienceDirect, ISI Web of Knowledge, etc. Also, it is absolutely impossible that Lambaré and his colleagues did not know of its existence before they published their first paper in a British journal in November 1998, where they labelled their "extension research" under the original name of Stereotomography.

Besides, by a strange coincidence the Centre de Géostatistique (GEOSTAT) is located in the very same building as the Centre de Géophysique in Fontainebleau.

Finally from those above irrefutable facts I can now conclude as follows:

Lambaré and his party of accomplices could not have ignored that "Stereotomography" was invented and coined by others to describe their innovative work for locating the rock mass fractures using RQD (rock quality designation), because there are so many numerous and various electronic archiving sources and search engines referring to it.

Furthermore Lambaré and others from GEOPHY and their neighbours from GEOSTAT have made the following reasoning:

a) "Stereotomography" of Dor & Labossière, which pretends to be a geostatistical method, could menace the interests of GEOSTAT in the long run.

b) The name could be "borrowed" from them and by doing so turn out their earth science technique as a geostatistical challenger in letting the GEOPHY revamp its old "extension research" as new geophysical material by the use of such a neologism.

Now I hope you will publish in its entirety this rectifier, which will surely interest and help your readers to make their own viewpoint about the "geophysical stereotomography" concocted by Lambaré and his Centre de Géophysique de Fontainebleau.

Yours truly,

André F. Labossière, mining eng.
Québec (Qc)

Dear Satinder,

The complaint by M. Labossière and M. Dor about our use of the word "Stereotomography" is an old story for us. In fact, the story began as early as 1999 and has never ended since!

When we published our first paper about the method in "The Geophysical Journal International" in 1998, (Billette and Lambaré, Velocity macro-model estimation from seismic reflection data by stereotomography, 135(2):671-690) we did absolutely not know the existence of the paper published by M. Labossière and M. Dor in Engineering Geology (Dec. 1984, 20(4): 311-324), which is not related to seismic methods.

About one year after the publication of our paper, they sent us an anonymous fax complaining about our use of the word "stereotomography" as a name for our approach. We decided that we would refer to their paper in a future publication, as we did in our paper Billette, F., Le Bégat, S., Podvin, P. and Lambaré, G., 2003, Practical aspects and applications of 2D stereotomography: Geophysics, vol. 68, No. 3, pp. 1008-1021.

We have no problem recognizing the anteriority of the use of the word Stereotomography by M. Labossière and M. Dor. We actually found out that this word had been introduced even earlier, in the medical imaging community, e.g.:Transverse tomography, oblique symmetric or obliqued tomography; stereotomography, P. de Vulpian, J Radiol. Electrol. Arch. Electr. Medicale, 1952, 33(5-6)272-4.

Despite our reaction, the complaints by M. Labossière and M. Dor have continued over the years. They not only sent faxes and mails to coauthors of our papers and to their administrations but also to people referring to the method, including geophysical service companies such as CGG. Until 2003, the complaints always took the form of anonymous faxes with no indication whatsoever that could allow us to answer. The very identity and the number of author(s) of these faxes remained unknown to us. It has thus never been possible for us to have a discussion with M. Labossière and M. Dor.

In fact, we believe that their complaint is not justified, and that they behaved very unfairly with us in the past 7 years.

Regards,

Gilles Lambaré
CGG
Massy, France