-I'd like you to include a comparison on one slide at the end of each at a high level of the theoretical % activations for the given x,y used in the expts, alongside the cv % on activities reported for the minimal NAD+ (you can also summarize this for minimal peptide).

AU/XG: We will include this in reports.

RC: This needs to be provided for the past data. Do you mean you will be posting an updated version of Fri’s report?  It should be very simple.

However, Guan should not slow down her work that needs to be done before departure.

AU,XG: please see the updated reports for xy values. They are going to post on wiki as well.

--

Please see below and put replies in the doc file, then post to wiki.

Thanks.

-

RC: Yes; my point is whether some of the sources of interday variation are relevant to % activation or not – since we don’t care about absolute activity but only relative activity. You should consider whether interday is more commonly used when one cares about the absolute (vs relative) measurements. For % activation, if there is an issue e.g. with column on one day (but not another) that affects control and modulator samples in the same way, that source of variation would seem to not be relevant to the conclusion.  In any case, this is most relevant if you are finding interday variation to be significantly greater than intraday.  So please consider this and if you have not seen much greater variation interday, you can proceed as planned. (As I recall, you could have used either inter or intraday – neither one was more convenient or faster than the other.)

AU/XG: As noted, inter- day or intra-day repeats do not save time.

“some of the sources of interday variation are relevant to % activation or not –“ –yes

Although inter-day variation is slightly more compared to intra-day repeats, as stated earlier, inter-day repeats should be used.

RC  (8/23):  Ok.  However, I would like to note something for future reference/exptl planning.  If  sources of interday variation that are not present in intraday variation are not relevant to % activation, then the rule of preferring interday repeats may not be very relevant.  In that case, with interday, we may see higher cvs on activities that may not have much impact on measurements of the extent of activation. See my comments above. These are general comments - here, they may not be relevant for the reasons you noted. However, please bear in mind for future planning -- please consider when preferring interday repeats actually makes sense and when it doesn't make much difference (i.e., don't do it blindly).

-I'd like you to include a comparison on one slide at the end of each at a high level of the theoretical % activations for the given x,y used in the expts, alongside the cv % on activities reported for the minimal NAD+ (you can also summarize this for minimal peptide).

AU/XG: We will include this in reports.

RC: This needs to be provided for the past data. Do you mean you will be posting an updated version of Fri’s report?  It should be very simple.

However, Guan should not slow down her work that needs to be done before departure.

-Why did AU not address the issue of reporting cv % on activity in the same way as XG, as mentioned by XG and RC after the last update?
Please revise.

AU:  AU48-PMC-Au3, slide 2 left panel data is similar to the XG’s. in future, AU will use same template what XG is using.
AU: We will have both % product formation and pmoles included in the report in the report.

RC: I don’t think you got my point. I am referring to the % cv not just reporting the % product formation and pmols. In your recent ppt you did not appear to report this consistently with XG. Are you saying you did? Perhaps I missed it.

Outstanding issues for XG/AU updates:

-Did not receive commentary regarding the intra- vs inter- per my most recent feedback. What was the final conclusion regarding what i asked you to consider?

-I'd like you to include a comparison on one slide at the end of each at a high level of the theoretical % activations for the given x,y used in the expts, alongside the cv % on activities reported for the minimal NAD+ (you can also summarize this for minimal peptide).

-Why did AU not address the issue of reporting cv % on activity in the same way as XG, as mentioned by XG and RC after the last update?
Please revise.

And then indicate whether AU's % cv on activity are similar to those of XG.

-Why did AU only go as low as 50uM while XG went to 10uM NAD+? Any reason for lack of alignment?

Raj