
From: Peter Fenwick [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 3:27 PM
To: 'jeffrey E.'
Subject: FW: Sunday experiment

Results of the Sunday =xperiment analysed by Fabio. 4 Subjects 18 trials and the =orrelation matrix.

We will try and do another this Saturday. =ou mentioned a dual pen recorder to confirm timing. That I will leave =o the main experiment as we will have plenty of timings available in =hat. This is a simple experiment, is it Cult or is it =nteresting? Looks interesting!

Let me know if you want =nything else for Saturday.

Peter

From: Fabio Babiloni =mailto:[REDACTED]
Sent: 07 May 2018 =0:14
To: Peter Fenwick <[REDACTED]>; Giuseppe Bersani <[REDACTED]>; Corazza, Ornella <[REDACTED]>; Andreas Ioannides <[REDACTED]>; Viirre, Erik <[REDACTED]>; Forget <[REDACTED]>
Subject: R: =unday experiment

Dear Peter,

thank you for sending such numbers to me. Indeed, it seems =hat something is moving there 😊

I have to state several =hings:

1. If the number of correlation tests performed is 4 (e.g. =lain against the four students) then the level of r to be taken into =onsideration by using Bonferroni correction is as follows ($r = .57$)

From this point of view we are quite close the same to the =ignificance for some of them.

2. However, Bonferroni correction is something that is quite harsh but it is indeed appropriate for multiple execution of unilateral tests. Maybe Holm will be more appropriate (resulting maybe in a lower threshold).
3. If you run the correlation everybody as everybody we obtained

e.g a correlation also between MC and =E which is slightly superior to those demonstrated between AF and MC. =/span>

Thus, the evidence in this first round =I just imagine exausting for AF) is interesting and encouraging for AF =nd MC and FE. In fact, the correlation is along the statistical =ignificance, although not definitively higher. It could be investigated =ore.

I would like to know who established =he sequence of AF and if sequence could be determined "a =riori" the next time you will run an experiment.

I suggest another day =when possible) with the same subjects, again 18 trials. Also, with a =equence predetermined for AF to be generated (maybe Andy could deliver =o Peter the binary sequence to be read by AF the day of the =xperiment).

Those data could be concatenated with =his actual data, giving a longer sequence of further significance for =ur investigation.

I also suggest to run an =xperiment:

1. without the presence of AF =/span>
2. with AF forced to generate all 0s. =/span>

This will set the "actual =ero" level of correlation (other than random binomial =istribution) of our experiment also. Although is very unpleasant to =uggest, is just to be sure that we remove further cricitisms from =eviewers by exploring the natural "noise" level of the =xperiment.

All the best from Dubai

Fabio

*****=*****

Prof. Fabio Babiloni, PhD

Ass. Editor of IEEE Transaction on Neural System & Rehabilitation Engineering

Ass. Editor of IEEE Transaction on Biomedical Engineering

Editor in Chief of International Journal of Bioelectromagnetism

Dept. Molecular Medicine, University of Rome Sapienza

Scientific Director of BrainSigns srl, www.brainsigns.com

*****=*****

Da: Peter Fenwick <

Inviato: lunedì 7 maggio 2018 0:14

A: 'Fabio Babiloni' <fabio.babiloni@uniroma1.it>; 'Corazza, Ornella'

Kevin Moore <

>; 'Andreas Ioannides' <andreas.ioannides@uniroma1.it>

=Viirre, Erik' <

Alain =orget' <

Oggetto: Sunday experiment

Hi all,

Thanks Fabio for our data analysis of the random data. I used the same data for Ian and it is labelled AF, only one set so they are all the same.

Sundays experiment has carried us forward. There are two outstanding subjects, and two subjects about chance. Is that correct Fabio. If it is then it means that we will have to select people up the experiential chain and possibly those who have evidence of the Siddhis as they are likely to show the most exciting neurophysiology.

That will limit us to about six subjects.

Sundays group all signed informed consent.

The number of years seeing the light is in the table below.

Do we now know enough to go forward. Comments please and Fabio what does the analysis show. Kevin and Andy any views.

Setting. A =lanket obscured AF from the subjects. Epoch length was 1 minute. =here was no noise in the giving or not giving of energy. 1 min then 30 =econds to rate data. If you would like to see the sheets I can =end them to you.

A great bank holiday w/e.

Best wishes,

Peter

=/p>

Il tuo 5 diventa 1000

Fai crescere la tua =niversità

Dona il 5 per mille alla =apienza



</=iv>