

Leslie Korn

From: Nayak Polissar [nayak@mwlight.com]
Sent: Monday, June 09, 2003 12:21 AM
To: lekorn@cwis.org; Rebecca Logsdon
Subject: Re: Update

Hi, Leslie and Rebecca,

This sounds like the normal process with nothing fatal in the critiques. Can you fax or email the actual critique? It would be helpful to see. Also, would you please email a copy of the final proposal, as submitted. Thank you, that will help in addressing these issues.

See some responses below, in caps.

Nayak

At 01:03 PM 6/5/2003, Leslie Korn wrote:

>Dear Nayak and Rebecca,

>

> I hope all goes well with you both. I thought rather than each a separate letter I would send this to both of you and engage your ideas even though one of you may have more comments in one area than another--For the purpose of wholism--you can gather some of the overall issues. First let me say that we got really outstanding reviews and in disucssion with the program officer we have a good chance of funding if we respond to the critiques. While we got a 178 -which is in normal funding range I understand that NCCAM is funding at about 138 this go-round.

>

>I am in the process of resubmitting the Polarity therapy for dementia caregivers proposal and the critiques posed a few questions. First let me say that all of them felt the statistical plan was superb-and I feel very fortunate to have you as part of this team. Because you are familiar with the nature of these critiques and their meaning (subtext) I shall forward to you some questions and welcome your ideas.

>

>My approach is to explain our rationale and in some cases to respond by making changes. So...

>

>These questions are:

>

>1. There is a question about whether the current design is large enough for stratification of native vs non native. I know we have discussed this as well given that we are limited by budgetary issues for our numbers in this pilot. How to address this question?

IF THEY MEAN CAN WE PRESENT MEANINGFUL RESULTS SEPARATELY FOR THESE TWO GROUPS, THEN WE HAVE TO HAVE THE FULL SAMPLE SIZE FOR EACH. IF THEY MEAN THAT THE NATIVE/NON-NATIVE IS AN IMPORTANT PREDICTOR, AND THAT WE SHOULD STRATIFY ON THIS PRIOR TO RANDOMIZATION (AS A METHOD OF CONTROL, AND NOT IN ORDER TO ANALYZE EACH SEPARATELY), THEN THAT MAY HAVE SOME MERIT. WE ONLY HAVE 20 PER GROUP. WHAT MIX OF NATIVE/NON-NATIVE DO WE EXPECT--PROPORTION IN EACH GROUP? IN ANY CASE, IF IT IS JUST STRATIFICATION AS A METHOD OF ONTROL, THEN WE CAN DO IT.

>We have chosen an active placebo of respite care. We chose this because it

>is, one, usual Rx for this group, and because we are testing whether
>Polarity is better than the usual Rx. We also chose it because we feel we
>need to give something substantial for the controls to comply and remain
>enrolled and because it is cheaper than another form of Rx.

>Two commenters suggested that the placebo may have sufficient power that it
>will diminish the effect of efficacy--the reviewer suggests that the respite
>people will take time out and do any number of things that we will not
>measure--our approach is to say--we don't care what they do-- we are just
>assessing the delivery of their having 3 hours "off" to do with as they
>wish--because thats how it works in the real world. Do you have any
>thoughts about each of these aspects as to ways we might further address
>this.

YOU DO NEED TO COMPARE TREATMENT TO SOMETHING, AND THAT SOMETHING SHOULD
NOT BE TRIVIAL. I DON'T THINK THAT YOU SHOULD COMPARE TO NO TREATMENT OR
NO ATTENTION WHATSOEVER, BECAUSE THAT KIND OF "STANDARD TREATMENT" IS NOT
LIKELY TO HAPPEN. ALSO, YOU NEED TO GUARD AGAINST THE HAWTHORNE EFFECT,
WHEREBY PEOPLE WHO ARE STUDIED GET BETTER, JUST BECAUSE OF THE ATTENTION OR
WHATEVER MYSTERIOUS THINGS HAPPEN WHEN STUDIES FOCUS ON PEOPLE. I THINK
THAT THE BEST THING IS TO LOOK IN AN EPI OR CLINICAL STUDIES TEXT AND GET
SOME GOOD AMMUNITION AGAINST THIS. I AM WORKING ON ANOTHER STUDY WHERE WE
ARE FACING THE SAME ISSUE, AND WE ARE TRYING TO GIVE THE CONTROL GROUP AS
MUCH ATTENTION AS THE TREATMENT GROUP, BUT THE CONTENT OF THE ATTENTION IS
DIFFERENT.

IN ANY CASE, THE BOTTOM LINE IS THAT THIS CLINICAL TRIAL NEEDS TO SHOW THAT
STUDY ATTENTION PLUS TREATMENT IS BETTER THAN STUDY ATTENTION ONLY. THE
RESPIRE CARE SEEMS GOOD TO ME, BECAUSE NO ONE CAN ARGUE THAT IT IS ANYTHING
LIKE THE POLARITY THERAPY, YET THERE IS SOMETHING BEING DONE FOR THE
PEOPLE--SOME ATTENTION.

use

>Another question speaks to How were the drop-out rates obtained? I recall
>Nayak suggested that we always consider that 20% will potentially drop-out.
>Can we back this up.

THIS WAS PULLED FROM AN IMPRESSION OF MINE GAINED FROM OTHER STUDIES. YOU
MAY HAVE GREATER OR LESSER DROPOUT. I SUGGEST DOING THE HOMEWORK AND FIND
OUT DROP-OUT RATES FROM OTHER STUDIES OF THIS POPULATION, STUDIES THAT
INVOLVED ABOUT THE SAME LEVEL OF COMMITMENT BY THE PARTICIPANTS. 20% IS
REALLY GOOD, AND IT MAY BE TOO OPTIMISTIC. THAT LEVEL IS REACHED IN STUDIES
OF CANCER PATIENTS, WHO ARE QUITE MOTIVATED TO LET THEIR DISEASE HELP OTHERS.

have references

>Rebecca, do you have any data on drop outs from your studies?

>
>I think thats it for now. Many thanks.

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Nayak Polissar [mailto:nayak@mwlight.com]
>Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2003 2:01 PM
>To: lekorn@cwis.org
>Subject: RE: hi

>Hi, Leslie,

>Thank you for the good news. I do hope that we get to do this very, very
>valuable study. And, it is kind of you to keep the team (of which I am
>part) informed of developments. I have worked with people who don't bother
>with those nice leadership touches, and I am very happy to work with
>someone now who is a sharing person.

>Yours,

>

>Nayak

>

>At 01:34 PM 3/23/2003, you wrote:

>

>>Hi Nayak

>>

>>Just a note to say we got a 178 from NIH--so I await an update from them
>and

>>we are thrilled! I hope all is well with you and your family. many thanks
>>for the holiday calendar.

>>

>>Warmest regards

>>

>>Leslie

>>

>>-----Original Message-----

>>From: Nayak Polissar [mailto:nayak@mwligh.com]

>>Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2002 3:23 PM

>>To: lekorn@cwis.org

>>Subject: hi

>>

>>

>>Hi, Leslie,

>>

>>I just talked with you. Here is my CV. I look upward and forward to
>>receiving your proposal and resume.

>>

>>Let's see what we can do.

>>

>>Best wishes,

>>

>>Nayak

>>

>>

>>

>>Nayak Polissar, Ph.D.

>>The Mountain-Whisper-Light Statistical Consulting

>>1827 23rd Ave East

>>Seattle, WA 98112-2913

>>(206) 329-9325, Fax (206) 324-5915

>>Please choose only one of the following email addresses.

>>Both reach me with equal speed.

>>nayak@mwligh.com (consulting)

>>polissar@u.washington.edu (academic)

>>

>>

>>

>>---

>>Incoming mail is certified Virus Free.

>>Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).

>>Version: 6.0.462 / Virus Database: 261 - Release Date: 3/13/2003

>>

>>Nayak Polissar, Ph.D.

>>The Mountain-Whisper-Light Statistical Consulting

>>1827 23rd Ave East

>>Seattle, WA 98112-2913

>>(206) 329-9325, Fax (206) 324-5915

>>Please choose only one of the following email addresses.

>>Both reach me with equal speed.

>>nayak@mwligh.com (consulting)

>>polissar@u.washington.edu (academic)

>>

>>

Leslie Korn

From: Nayak Polissar [nayak@mwlight.com]
Sent: Monday, June 09, 2003 12:21 AM
To: lekom@cwis.org; Rebecca Logsdon
Subject: Re: Update

Hi, Leslie and Rebecca,

This sounds like the normal process with nothing fatal in the critiques. Can you fax or email the actual critique? It would be helpful to see. Also, would you please email a copy of the final proposal, as submitted. Thank you, that will help in addressing these issues.

See some responses below, in caps.

Nayak

At 01:03 PM 6/5/2003, Leslie Korn wrote:

>Dear Nayak and Rebecca,

>

> I hope all goes well with you both. I thought rather than each a separate
 >letter I would send this to both of you and engage your ideas even though
 >one of you may have more comments in one area than another--For the purpose
 >of wholism--you can gather some of the overall issues. First let me say that
 >we got really outstanding reviews and in disucssion with the program officer
 >we have a good chance of funding if we respond to the critiques. While we
 >got a 178 -which is in normal funding range I understand that NCCAM is
 >funding at about 138 this go-round.

>

>I am in the process of resubmitting the Polarity therapy for dementia
 >caregivers proposal and the critiques posed a few questions. First let me
 >say that all of them felt the statistical plan was superb-and I feel very
 >fortunate to have you as part of this team. Because you are familiar with
 >the nature of these critiques and their meaning (subtext) I shall forward to
 >you some questions and welcome your ideas.

>

>My approach is to explain our rationale and in some cases to respond by
 >making changes. So...

>

>These questions are:

>

>1. There is a question about whether the current design is large enough for
 >stratification of native vs non native. I know we have discussed this as
 >well given that we are limited by budgetary issues for our numbers in this
 >pilot. How to address this question?

IF THEY MEAN CAN WE PRESENT MEANINGFUL RESULTS SEPARATELY FOR THESE TWO
 GROUPS, THEN WE HAVE TO HAVE THE FULL SAMPLE SIZE FOR EACH. IF THEY MEAN
 THAT THE NATIVE/NON-NATIVE IS AN IMPORTANT PREDICTOR, AND THAT WE SHOULD
 STRATIFY ON THIS PRIOR TO RANDOMIZATION (AS A METHOD OF CONTROL, AND NOT IN
 ORDER TO ANALYZE EACH SEPARATELY), THEN THAT MAY HAVE SOME MERIT. WE ONLY
 HAVE 20 PER GROUP. WHAT MIX OF NATIVE/NON-NATIVE DO WE EXPECT--PROPORTION
 IN EACH GROUP? IN ANY CASE, IF IT IS JUST STRATIFICATION AS A METHOD OF
 ONTROL, THEN WE CAN DO IT.

>We have chosen an active placebo of respite care. We chose this because it

>is, one, usual Rx for this group, and because we are testing whether
>Polarity is better than the usual Rx. We also chose it because we feel we
>need to give something substantial for the controls to comply and remain
>enrolled and because it is cheaper than another form of Rx.

>Two commenters suggested that the placebo may have sufficient power that it
>will diminish the effect of efficacy--the reviewer suggests that the respite
>people will take time out and do any number of things that we will not
>measure--our approach is to say--we don't care what they do-- we are just
>assessing the delivery of their having 3 hours "off" to do with as they
>wish--because thats how it works in the real world. Do you have any
>thoughts about each of these aspects as to ways we might further address
>this.

YOU DO NEED TO COMPARE TREATMENT TO SOMETHING, AND THAT SOMETHING SHOULD
NOT BE TRIVIAL. I DON'T THINK THAT YOU SHOULD COMPARE TO NO TREATMENT OR
NO ATTENTION WHATSOEVER, BECAUSE THAT KIND OF "STANDARD TREATMENT" IS NOT
LIKELY TO HAPPEN. ALSO, YOU NEED TO GUARD AGAINST THE HAWTHORNE EFFECT,
WHEREBY PEOPLE WHO ARE STUDIED GET BETTER, JUST BECAUSE OF THE ATTENTION OR
WHATEVER MYSTERIOUS THINGS HAPPEN WHEN STUDIES FOCUS ON PEOPLE. I THINK
THAT THE BEST THING IS TO LOOK IN AN EPI OR CLINICAL STUDIES TEXT AND GET
SOME GOOD AMMUNITION AGAINST THIS. I AM WORKING ON ANOTHER STUDY WHERE WE
ARE FACING THE SAME ISSUE, AND WE ARE TRYING TO GIVE THE CONTROL GROUP AS
MUCH ATTENTION AS THE TREATMENT GROUP, BUT THE CONTENT OF THE ATTENTION IS
DIFFERENT.

IN ANY CASE, THE BOTTOM LINE IS THAT THIS CLINICAL TRIAL NEEDS TO SHOW THAT
STUDY ATTENTION PLUS TREATMENT IS BETTER THAN STUDY ATTENTION ONLY. THE
RESPITE CARE SEEMS GOOD TO ME, BECAUSE NO ONE CAN ARGUE THAT IT IS ANYTHING
LIKE THE POLARITY THERAPY, YET THERE IS SOMETHING BEING DONE FOR THE
PEOPLE--SOME ATTENTION.

use

>Another question speaks to How were the drop-out rates obtained? I recall
>Nayak suggested that we always consider that 20% will potentially drop-out.
>Can we back this up.

THIS WAS PULLED FROM AN IMPRESSION OF MINE GAINED FROM OTHER STUDIES. YOU
MAY HAVE GREATER OR LESSER DROPOUT. I SUGGEST DOING THE HOMEWORK AND FIND
OUT DROP-OUT RATES FROM OTHER STUDIES OF THIS POPULATION, STUDIES THAT
INVOLVED ABOUT THE SAME LEVEL OF COMMITMENT BY THE PARTICIPANTS. 20% IS
REALLY GOOD, AND IT MAY BE TOO OPTIMISTIC. THAT LEVEL IS REACHED IN STUDIES
OF CANCER PATIENTS, WHO ARE QUITE MOTIVATED TO LET THEIR DISEASE HELP OTHERS.

have references

>Rebecca, do you have any data on drop outs from your studies?

>
>I think thats it for now. Many thanks.

>
>-----Original Message-----

>From: Nayak Polissar [mailto:nayak@mwlight.com]

>Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2003 2:01 PM

>To: lekorn@cwis.org

>Subject: RE: hi

>
>
>Hi, Leslie,

>
>Thank you for the good news. I do hope that we get to do this very, very
>valuable study. And, it is kind of you to keep the team (of which I am
>part) informed of developments. I have worked with people who don't bother
>with those nice leadership touches, and I am very happy to work with
>someone now who is a sharing person.

>Yours,

>

>Nayak

>

At 01:34 PM 3/23/2003, you wrote:

>

>>Hi Nayak

>>

>>Just a note to say we got a 178 from NIH--so I await an update from them
>and

>>we are thrilled! I hope all is well with you and your family. many thanks
>>for the holiday calendar.

>>

>>Warmest regards

>>

>>Leslie

>>

>>-----Original Message-----

>>From: Nayak Polissar [mailto:nayak@mwlight.com]

>>Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2002 3:23 PM

>>To: lekorn@cwis.org

>>Subject: hi

>>

>>

>>Hi, Leslie,

>>

>>I just talked with you. Here is my CV. I look upward and forward to
>>receiving your proposal and resume.

>>

>>Let's see what we can do.

>>

>>Best wishes,

>>

>>Nayak

>>

>>

>>

>>Nayak Polissar, Ph.D.

>>The Mountain-Whisper-Light Statistical Consulting

>>1827 23rd Ave East

>>Seattle, WA 98112-2913

>>(206) 329-9325, Fax (206) 324-5915

>>Please choose only one of the following email addresses.

>>Both reach me with equal speed.

>>nayak@mwlight.com (consulting)

>>polissar@u.washington.edu (academic)

>>

>>

>>

>>-----

>>Incoming mail is certified Virus Free.

>>Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).

>>Version: 6.0.462 / Virus Database: 261 - Release Date: 3/13/2003

>>

>>Nayak Polissar, Ph.D.

>>The Mountain-Whisper-Light Statistical Consulting

>>1827 23rd Ave East

>>Seattle, WA 98112-2913

>>(206) 329-9325, Fax (206) 324-5915

>>Please choose only one of the following email addresses.

>>Both reach me with equal speed.

>>nayak@mwlight.com (consulting)

>>polissar@u.washington.edu (academic)

>>

>>

Leslie Korn

From: Nayak Polissar [nayak@mweight.com]
Sent: Monday, June 09, 2003 12:21 AM
To: lekom@cwis.org; Rebecca Logsdon
Subject: Re: Update

Hi, Leslie and Rebecca,

This sounds like the normal process with nothing fatal in the critiques. Can you fax or email the actual critique? It would be helpful to see. Also, would you please email a copy of the final proposal, as submitted. Thank you, that will help in addressing these issues.

See some responses below, in caps.

Nayak

At 01:03 PM 6/5/2003, Leslie Korn wrote:

>Dear Nayak and Rebecca,

>

> I hope all goes well with you both. I thought rather than each a separate
 >letter I would send this to both of you and engage your ideas even though
 >one of you may have more comments in one area than another--For the purpose
 >of wholism--you can gather some of the overall issues. First let me say that
 >we got really outstanding reviews and in disucssion with the program officer
 >we have a good chance of funding if we respond to the critiques. While we
 >got a 178 -which is in normal funding range I understand that NCCAM is
 >funding at about 138 this go-round.

>

>I am in the process of resubmitting the Polarity therapy for dementia
 >caregivers proposal and the critiques posed a few questions. First let me
 >say that all of them felt the statistical plan was superb-and I feel very
 >fortunate to have you as part of this team. Because you are familiar with
 >the nature of these critiques and their meaning (subtext) I shall forward to
 >you some questions and welcome your ideas.

>

>My approach is to explain our rationale and in some cases to respond by
 >making changes. So...

>

>These questions are:

>

>1. There is a question about whether the current design is large enough for
 >stratification of native vs non native. I know we have discussed this as
 >well given that we are limited by budgetary issues for our numbers in this
 >pilot. How to address this question?

IF THEY MEAN CAN WE PRESENT MEANINGFUL RESULTS SEPARATELY FOR THESE TWO
 GROUPS, THEN WE HAVE TO HAVE THE FULL SAMPLE SIZE FOR EACH. IF THEY MEAN
 THAT THE NATIVE/NON-NATIVE IS AN IMPORTANT PREDICTOR, AND THAT WE SHOULD
 STRATIFY ON THIS PRIOR TO RANDOMIZATION (AS A METHOD OF CONTROL, AND NOT IN
 ORDER TO ANALYZE EACH SEPARATELY), THEN THAT MAY HAVE SOME MERIT. WE ONLY
 HAVE 20 PER GROUP. WHAT MIX OF NATIVE/NON-NATIVE DO WE EXPECT--PROPORTION
 IN EACH GROUP? IN ANY CASE, IF IT IS JUST STRATIFICATION AS A METHOD OF
 ONTROL, THEN WE CAN DO IT.

>We have chosen an active placebo of respite care. We chose this because it

>is, one, usual Rx for this group, and because we are testing whether
>Polarity is better than the usual Rx. We also chose it because we feel we
>need to give something substantial for the controls to comply and remain
>enrolled and because it is cheaper than another form of Rx.

>Two commenters suggested that the placebo may have sufficient power that it
>will diminish the effect of efficacy--the reviewer suggests that the respite
>people will take time out and do any number of things that we will not
>measure--our approach is to say--we don't care what they do-- we are just
>assessing the delivery of their having 3 hours "off" to do with as they
>wish--because thats how it works in the real world. Do you have any
>thoughts about each of these aspects as to ways we might further address
>this.

YOU DO NEED TO COMPARE TREATMENT TO SOMETHING, AND THAT SOMETHING SHOULD
NOT BE TRIVIAL. I DON'T THINK THAT YOU SHOULD COMPARE TO NO TREATMENT OR
NO ATTENTION WHATSOEVER, BECAUSE THAT KIND OF "STANDARD TREATMENT" IS NOT
LIKELY TO HAPPEN. ALSO, YOU NEED TO GUARD AGAINST THE HAWTHORNE EFFECT,
WHEREBY PEOPLE WHO ARE STUDIED GET BETTER, JUST BECAUSE OF THE ATTENTION OR
WHATEVER MYSTERIOUS THINGS HAPPEN WHEN STUDIES FOCUS ON PEOPLE. I THINK
THAT THE BEST THING IS TO LOOK IN AN EPI OR CLINICAL STUDIES TEXT AND GET
SOME GOOD AMMUNITION AGAINST THIS. I AM WORKING ON ANOTHER STUDY WHERE WE
ARE FACING THE SAME ISSUE, AND WE ARE TRYING TO GIVE THE CONTROL GROUP AS
MUCH ATTENTION AS THE TREATMENT GROUP, BUT THE CONTENT OF THE ATTENTION IS
DIFFERENT.

IN ANY CASE, THE BOTTOM LINE IS THAT THIS CLINICAL TRIAL NEEDS TO SHOW THAT
STUDY ATTENTION PLUS TREATMENT IS BETTER THAN STUDY ATTENTION ONLY. THE
RESPITE CARE SEEMS GOOD TO ME, BECAUSE NO ONE CAN ARGUE THAT IT IS ANYTHING
LIKE THE POLARITY THERAPY, YET THERE IS SOMETHING BEING DONE FOR THE
PEOPLE--SOME ATTENTION.

use

>Another question speaks to How were the drop-out rates obtained? I recall
>Nayak suggested that we always consider that 20% will potentially drop-out.
>Can we back this up.

THIS WAS PULLED FROM AN IMPRESSION OF MINE GAINED FROM OTHER STUDIES. YOU
MAY HAVE GREATER OR LESSER DROPOUT. I SUGGEST DOING THE HOMEWORK AND FIND
OUT DROP-OUT RATES FROM OTHER STUDIES OF THIS POPULATION, STUDIES THAT
INVOLVED ABOUT THE SAME LEVEL OF COMMITMENT BY THE PARTICIPANTS. 20% IS
REALLY GOOD, AND IT MAY BE TOO OPTIMISTIC. THAT LEVEL IS REACHED IN STUDIES
OF CANCER PATIENTS, WHO ARE QUITE MOTIVATED TO LET THEIR DISEASE HELP OTHERS.

have references

>Rebecca, do you have any data on drop outs from your studies?

>
>I think thats it for now. Many thanks.

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Nayak Polissar [mailto:nayak@mwlight.com]
>Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2003 2:01 PM
>To: lekorn@cwis.org
>Subject: RE: hi

>Hi, Leslie,

>Thank you for the good news. I do hope that we get to do this very, very
>valuable study. And, it is kind of you to keep the team (of which I am
>part) informed of developments. I have worked with people who don't bother
>with those nice leadership touches, and I am very happy to work with
>someone now who is a sharing person.

>Yours,

>

>Nayak

>

At 01:34 PM 3/23/2003, you wrote:

>

> >Hi Nayak

> >

> >Just a note to say we got a 178 from NIH--so I await an update from them
> >and

> >we are thrilled! I hope all is well with you and your family. many thanks
> >for the holiday calendar.

> >

> >Warmest regards

> >

> >Leslie

> >

> >-----Original Message-----

> >From: Nayak Polissar [mailto:nayak@mwlight.com]

> >Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2002 3:23 PM

> >To: lekorn@cwis.org

> >Subject: hi

> >

> >

> >Hi, Leslie,

> >

> >I just talked with you. Here is my CV. I look upward and forward to
> >receiving your proposal and resume.

> >

> >Let's see what we can do.

> >

> >Best wishes,

> >

> >Nayak

> >

> >

> >

> >Nayak Polissar, Ph.D.

> >The Mountain-Whisper-Light Statistical Consulting

> >1827 23rd Ave East

> >Seattle, WA 98112-2913

> >(206) 329-9325, Fax (206) 324-5915

> >Please choose only one of the following email addresses.

> >Both reach me with equal speed.

> >nayak@mwlight.com (consulting)

> >polissar@u.washington.edu (academic)

> >

> >

> >

> >---

> >Incoming mail is certified Virus Free.

> >Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).

> >Version: 6.0.462 / Virus Database: 261 - Release Date: 3/13/2003

>

>Nayak Polissar, Ph.D.

>The Mountain-Whisper-Light Statistical Consulting

>1827 23rd Ave East

>Seattle, WA 98112-2913

>(206) 329-9325, Fax (206) 324-5915

>Please choose only one of the following email addresses.

>Both reach me with equal speed.

>nayak@mwlight.com (consulting)

>polissar@u.washington.edu (academic)

>

>