Follow up 1/27/2012 meeting

Attendees: Gil, Linus, Ma, Michael, Qin, Tupler, Zhu

Hello everyone,
As a follow-up to the meeting on 1/27/2012, below are the notes and the action items I recorded. Please advise if I have missed anything.

**Meeting Notes**

1. Data analysis
   a. ROCF (Caesar)
      i. Overall improvement:
         1. Visual-aid condition shows highest improvement while haptic-aid condition shows lowest improvement.
         2. Visual-aid and combination conditions were better than VR conditions in Study 1.
         3. Combination condition in Study 2 showed similar improvement as the augmented VR condition in Study 1.
         4. Since native condition in the first study showed negative improvement, it will be removed from the graph.
      ii. Analysis of 5 segments:
         1. Long line segment,
         2. Short line segment,
         3. Parallel,
         4. Proportional, and
         5. Circular.
         6. (Kaber) They need literary basis how they can be separated.
            a. (Tupler) Need to check EFT literature.
         7. (Tupler) Need to consider how these segments can effect the ROCF score improvement.
         8. Need to break down within 5 segments.
            a. Separate data to know which can give more score than others.
            b. Use descriptive statistics (Mean, SD, Var...)
   b. Pre & Post test (Janet)
      i. Use pre-test results of EFT to classify subjects into three types based on the level of field independence:
         1. (Kaber) Previous study remove middle range of the EFT scores (10~16).
      ii. No significant interaction effect exists between the treatment (condition) and the covariate (EFT_score).
      iii. No significant difference in the BD % improvement among the three conditions and the score in pre-test EFT has no significant influence to the BD performance improvement.
iv. Level of field independence has a significant influence on the subjects’ performance in block design pre-test.

v. (Tupler) In BD pre-test results, FID people already had good points.
   1. FD may have more room to improve the score.
   2. Haptic is good for FD

c. Therapy session (Biwen)
   i. ANCOVA analysis
      1. EFT as a covariate
      2. Result revealed that the higher EFT scores showed quicker learning rate (K).

d. Visual assistance (Linus)
   i. Average use of visual assistance over trials:
      1. Visual-aid condition showed the higher number of use than combination condition. (significant)
   ii. Touching target by trial
      1. The number of use has been decreased by trials.
      2. (Michael) First trial of third day showed different trend between combination and visual-aid conditions.
   iii. Touching target by design
      1. The number of use has been increased when the complexity has been increased (1 → 13).
      2. (Kaber) This graph should be modified or redrew since the order of design is not from 4 to 13. They were random.
         a. For example, should compare the data in the order and design (1 vs. 8 trials and 4 vs. 13 design).

2. Next schedules:
   a. Next experiment will restart after completing the report.
   b. Experiment setup should be moved to another place for mTBI patients and fMRI device.
   c. Report due is Jun 30.
      i. Will finish report by 4/1/2012
      ii. Janet will organize report

3. To do:
   a. Janet will lead data analysis team to write a report (Janet, Caesar, Linus)
   b. Michael and Guk-Ho will resubmit manuscript.

These are all the items that I noted or recalled from the meeting. If you have other points, please let me know.
Guk-Ho Gil