

From: Conrad Swartz <cswartz@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 9, 2009 5:43 PM
To: Richard Abrams
Subject: Re: A meta-analysis of ECT efficacy published in Lancet

Richard,

I am ok with leaving it off altogether.

Conrad

On Tue, Jun 9, 2009 at 3:10 PM, Richard Abrams <richard.abrams@gmail.com> wrote:
Conrad,

The problem is that they're going to read the article and see that we have fudged the conclusion considerably--I'd rather just leave that part off altogether.

Dick

On Tue, Jun 9, 2009 at 4:33 PM, Conrad Swartz <cswartz@gmail.com> wrote:
Richard,

That wording may directly suggest to the FDA that we need to collect sufficient new evidence to evaluate persistence of cognitive side-effects. I realize that my original wording editorializes the matter but I aim to avoid handing the FDA a stick to beat us with. It is one thing if someone else says it but quite different if we say it, because we will then have no possible rebuttal.

Conrad

On Tue, Jun 9, 2009 at 1:19 PM, Richard Abrams <richard.abrams@gmail.com> wrote:
Conrad,

I ended up changing the sentence to the less misleading **Evidence has not been sufficient to evaluate persistence of cognitive side effects over time.**

Dick

On Tue, Jun 9, 2009 at 12:53 PM, Conrad Swartz <cswartz@gmail.com> wrote:
Richard:

Sure. I have one suggestion. It is to restate the next-to-last sentence of the addition as:

Evidence has not been sufficient to demonstrate the persistence of cognitive side effects over time.

This looks more favorable but says the same.
--Conrad