

December 3, 1936

My dear Bliss,

I am very glad you like the 6th edition, which it was a pleasure to send you. I had noticed the errors you mention as soon as I came back and found the book printed. On the first question the answer, as they say in Parliament, is in the affirmative, and on the second point, I know no better method than partial regression.

Your third question is a bigger one: in many such cases, and especially where actual numbers are counted, e.g., number of mistakes made before an animal or human subject learns a particular task, it is convenient to group the scores on the basis of a geometric progression, e.g., 0, 1-2, 4-7, 8-15 and so on, or 0, 1-2, 3-4, 5-8, 9-16, and to use the ordinal values of these classes as the effective variate. The means of such ordinal values are then often not too badly distributed and the advantage gained that only rough counts are needed when the numbers are high. After all, a sufficient scrutiny to say that there is at least one mite and not more than ten on a leaf must mean that the mites are actually counted. Of course a classification into broader ^{classes} ~~categories~~ would equally be possible, such as 0, 1, 2-5, 6-25, 6-125, etc. For an infestation problem such a geometric series is especially appropriate, since the logarithm of the number found may well be really a measure of the length of time during which

the infestation has been undisturbedly in progress.

Yours sincerely