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

Results of the Sunday experiment analysed by Fabio. 4 Subjects 18 trials and the correlation matrix.

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

Let me know if you want anything else for Saturday.

Peter

From: Fabio Babiloni =mailto:[REDACTED]
Sent: 07 May 2018 10:14
To: Peter Fenwick [REDACTED]; Giuseppe Bersani <[REDACTED]>; Corazza, Ornella =mailto:[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Andreas Ioannides =mailto:[REDACTED]; Viirre, Erik
[REDACTED] Forget <[REDACTED]>
Subject: R: Sunday experiment

Dear Peter,

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

I have to state several things:

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

From this point of view we are quite close the same to the significance 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.

Thus, the evidence in this first round (I just imagine exhausting for AF) is interesting and encouraging for AF and MC and FE. In fact, the correlation is along the statistical significance, although not definitively higher. It could be investigated more.

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

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

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

I also suggest to run an experiment:

1. without the presence of AF
2. with AF forced to generate all 0s.

This will set the "actual zero" level of correlation (other than random binomial distribution) of our experiment also. Although is very unpleasant to suggest, is just to be sure that we remove further criticisms from reviewers by exploring the natural "noise" level of the experiment.

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, <http://www.brainsigns.com/>>www.brainsigns.com

*****_*****

Da: Peter Fenwick <[REDACTED]>
Inviato: lunedì 7 maggio 2018 0:14
A: 'Fabio Babiloni' <[REDACTED]>; 'Corazza, Ornella' <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]>; Kevin Moore <[REDACTED]>; Andreas Ioannides <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]>; Erik Viirre <[REDACTED]>; Alain Forget <[REDACTED]>
Oggetto: Sunday experiment

Hi all,

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

Sundays experiment was 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 blanket obscured AF from the subjects. Epoch length was 1 minute. There was no noise in the giving or not giving of energy. 1 min then 30 seconds to rate data. If you would like to see the sheets I can send them to you.

A great bank holiday w/e.

Best wishes,

Peter

_____/p>

Il tuo 5 diventa 1000

Fai crescere la tua università

Dona il 5 per mille alla sapienza



</iv>