



Sara C. Mednick, Assistant Professor
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
RIVERSIDE, CA 92521-0128
TEL: (951) 827-5259
FAX: (951) 827-3985

smednick@ucr.edu
www.saramednick.com

September 18, 2015

To Whom It May Concern,

As an academic who is also interested in seeing sound scientific ideas reach beyond the handful of individuals reading peer-reviewed scientific journals, I find the FTC's ruling against Aaron Seitz extremely disturbing and their results unfair, unscientific, and unfounded.

Firstly, Aaron Seitz is known as one of the most careful, detail-oriented and thorough researchers in the field of perception. He is also an innovator who sees beyond the data to the possibilities of what the data could mean to normal people. He is deeply devoted to translational research and thus has been brave enough to be one of the very few researchers to migrate his most well-established findings into a clinical domain to help people with low vision and to help non-clinical people improve normal vision. The results of his studies have been published in top journals, having gone through the most rigorous review process possible, which demonstrates the ability for these results to be trusted and stand on their own. The process that the FTC went through to judge the merit of these results does not resemble anything like a peer-review in which experts in the field assess the merits of the research. It appears that the FTC used non-experts to assess the scientific findings, which indicates that reviewed Dr. Seitz's research was not qualified to review his research.

Secondly, there are many brain game apps that are widely used by the public, bringing in a lot of money to the companies who support them, and whose claims have not been tested through rigorous scientific study. It is therefore, curious to me that Dr. Seitz's work was targeted by the FTC rather than the larger companies that maintain lawyers and funds to handle these situations. Not only was Dr. Seitz's reputation as a scientist harmed, but his personal bank account was also tapped with lawyers' fees and fines. All this because he attempted to make available to the public an effective brain training technique to improve the welfare of a wide range of clinical populations as well as improving normal abilities. I hope that the FTC reconsiders their decisions on this particular case as well as all future cases in which scientists attempt to make a difference in the world.

Sincerely,

^

—
Sara C. Mednick