

RE: alicia

Alicia L Carriquiry

Fri 3/20/2009 7:25 AM

To: RM Fleming <rmfmd7@hotmail.com>; Mike Hansen PD corrected <mike_hansen@fd.org>;

Cc: mskaiser@iastate.edu <mskaiser@iastate.edu>;

I am sorry I did not write yesterday as promised. Something came up and I had to leave earlier.

I am copying Mark Kaiser, who was, after all, the person who wrote the report. Just so that you know, Mark started his analyses in the belief that the data had in fact been fabricated and set out to show this was the case. While we cannot prove beyond a doubt that they were not, no one can prove that they were, either. In fact, I believe that no one could even find any plausible evidence pointing to fraud in the data themselves. Mark certainly could not and he tried very hard.

So the points I wished to make are the following:

- * There is no evidence in the data to suggest that they were fabricated.
- * Fabricating these data would require a level of statistical sophistication that we doubt Dr. Fleming possesses (no offense!). Mark or I or any good statistician might have been able to do it, but it would have taken quite some thinking.

Mike, I do not believe that I have "changed my story". I told you in an earlier conversation that statistics is not magic and that it is not possible to prove (in the real sense of the word) that data are not fabricated. I continue to stand by that statement. It is true that it is not possible to prove (or disprove) with 100% certainty that the data are falsified. Unless, of course, a person tampering with data does so in a really incompetent manner. If these data were fraudulent, then Dr. Fleming is either a professional closet statistician, is lvery lucky, or hired someone to do it.

Best wishes,

Alicia

At 05:18 PM 3/19/2009, RM Fleming wrote:

Mike,

She promised to email you with these statements that (1) the study was analyzed as the ORI would have, (2) there is no evidence of fraud in the analysis and (3) that to produce fraudulent data would have required a level of sophistication that even the world renown ISU could not produce.

Dr. Fleming

- > Subject: Re: alicia
- > To: rmfmd7@hotmail.com

> From: Mike_Hansen@fd.org
> Date: Thu, 19 Mar 2009 16:53:13 -0500
>
> We have not heard from her. If this is so, and she has changed her
> opinion, she needs to contact us regarding her statistical opinion.
>
> Mike
>
>
>
> RM Fleming
> <rmfmd7@hotmail.c
> om> To
> Mike Hansen PD corrected
> 03/19/2009 02:57 <mike_hansen@fd.org>
> PM cc
>
> Subject
> alicia
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Mike,
>
> The report from Kaiser does not need to be given to the prosecutors..
> Simply have Carriquiry show up and state they analyzed the data in
> accordance with ORI and not only is there no evidence of fraud (and Kaiser
> thought I was lying and set out to prove the data was made up and could
> not) and that to fabricate such data would require more sophistication than
> ISU. My transcripts will show I don't have the training background.
> Counts 11-13 do not stipulate soy chips vs. soy shakes, only the number 60
> participants. The 7 April 2004 study result is not even a part of the
> counts.
>
> Dr. Fleming
>
> Windows Live™: Keep your life in sync. Check it out.

Windows Live™: Keep your life in sync. [Check it out.](#)

Alicia Carriquiry

Professor of Statistics
Iowa State University and Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile
Ames, IA 50011-1210, USA Vicuna Mackenna 4860
San Joaquin, Santiago, CHILE
US Tel: 1-515-294-3440 Chile Tel: 56-2-354-7204
US Fax: 1-515-294-4040 Chile Fax: 56-2-354-7229
alicia@iastate.edu