causes platelet shape change, and G_q activates phospholipase C- β and intracellular Ca^{2+} flux. Unlike Stampfuss *et al.*, we have not been able to detect significant inhibition by 3

M P4pal-10 of U46619-induced shape change or aggregation of gel-filtered human platelets, even at concentrations of U46619 as low as 0.38 M (unpublished data). We have also measured U46619-dependent activation of Ca^{2+} flux in washed human platelets prepared by the method of Weber and Schrör⁶. As previously shown, 3 M P4pal-10 blocks the prolonged Ca^{2+} response generated by PAR-4 (refs. 2,10). In contrast, we did not detect a significant effect of P4pal-10 on thromboxane receptor-dependent Ca^{2+} flux induced by 0.1–0.6 M U46619 (unpub-

lished data). Because we have not observed interference of the PAR-4 pepducin with U46619-induced platelet shape change, aggregation or Ca^{2+} mobilization, we contend that it is unlikely that this pepducin significantly interferes with thromboxane signaling in platelets.

COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT

The authors declare competing financial interests (see the *Nature Medicine* website for details).

Lidija Covic, Suzanne Jacques & Athan Kuliopulos

Division of Hematology-Oncology, Molecular Cardiology Research Institute, Tufts-New England Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts, 02111, USA.

e-mail: athan.kuliopulos@tufts.edu

1. Covic, L., Gresser, A.L., Talavera, J., Swift, S. & Kuliopulos, A. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **99**, 643–648 (2002).
2. Covic, L., Misra, M., Badar, J., Singh, C. & Kuliopulos, A. *Nat. Med.* **8**, 1161–1165 (2002).
3. Ashby, B., Colman, R.W., Danial, J.L., Kunapuli, S.P. & Smith, J.B. in *Hemostasis and Thrombosis. Basic Principles and Clinical Practice* 4th edn. (eds. Colman, R.W., Hirsh, J., Marder, V.J., Clowes, A.W. & George, J.N.) 505–520 (Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Philadelphia, 2001).
4. Muck, S., Weber, A.-A. & Schrör, K. *Eur. J. Pharmacol.* **344**, 45–48 (1998).
5. Bahou, W.F. *Nat. Med.* **8**, 1082–1083 (2002).
6. Weber, A.-A. & Schrör, K. *Blood* **98**, 1619–1621 (2001).
7. Weber, A.-A., Przytulski, B., Schanz, A., Hohlfeld, T. & Schrör, K. *Platelets* **13**, 37–40 (2002).
8. Hirata, T., Ushikubi, F., Kakizuka, A., Okuma, M. & Narumiya, S. *J. Clin. Invest.* **97**, 949–956 (1996).
9. Paul, B.Z.S., Jin, J. & Kunapuli, S.P. *J. Biol. Chem.* **274**, 29108–29114 (1999).
10. Covic, L., Gresser, A.L. & Kuliopulos, A. *Biochemistry* **39**, 5458–5467 (2000).

Remembering Trauma revisited

To the editor:

David Spiegel's review of my book, *Remembering Trauma* (*Nat. Med.* **9**, 1251–1252; 2003), contains serious errors. First, Spiegel wrongly states, "McNally insists elsewhere that clinicians' judgments of the veracity of trauma memories are completely unreliable." Never have I made such an absurd, sweeping generalization.

Second, after discussing the risk of symptom exaggeration among war veterans seeking compensation for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), I emphasize that, "this does not mean that most veterans diagnosed with PTSD are malingerers" (chapter 10). Yet Spiegel writes as though I believe otherwise: "But in his discussion [of possible malingering], 'may' slides into 'does.'"

Third, Spiegel claims that my analysis of trauma and memory is "simplistic," yet he does not provide any evidence or argument to support his claim. Although he proceeds to mention certain studies on trauma, emotion, and memory, I discuss each of those in chapters 2 and 6.

Fourth, Spiegel incorrectly states that I do "not mention that *Psychological Bulletin* published two full-length methodological criticisms" of Bruce Rind's meta-analysis of studies on the psychological consequences of childhood sexual abuse (suggesting that sexually abused children are far more resilient than most of us had suspected). Not only do I mention both critiques in chapter 1, including one cowritten by Spiegel, but I also cite Rind's devastating rebuttals of both. In fact, a

committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Science examined Rind's meta-analysis and, after finding nothing methodologically amiss, rebuked the critics for misunderstanding and politicizing Rind's article.

Finally, if the Rind controversy was not "political," then why did the critics furnish ammunition for Congressional Resolution 107—Congress's formal condemnation of the alleged moral and methodological flaws of Rind's article? If that's not political, what is?

Richard J. McNally

Department of Psychology, Harvard University, 33 Kirkland Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA.

e-mail: rjm@wjh.harvard.edu