

March 10, 1937

Dear Yates,

I think reviews of that kind are really extremely useful, especially, perhaps, for American consumption.

I have received a copy of your Experiment Design paper, with a few more sections - though I think there are three or four more to come.

On consideration, I think it is rather important that you should take this opportunity to reconsider the terminology for the various designs which you have put forward: I mean that it seems quite unnecessary that you should feel bound to stick to the terms used on first publication if, when other designs have been ^{worked out} published, these terms come to seem less appropriate than they did at first. I do not know whether you or I was first guilty of the term "pseudo-factorial", but I think now that it really fails descriptively as well as etymologically. "Quasi-factorial" would be decidedly better in both respects, but your problem is really a much bigger one than such modifications, for arrangements such as you have called the "pseudo Latin square" are equally quasi-factorial, and it is clear that you will need, not only broad descriptive terms for new principles of arrangement, but particular terms, which should be much neater, for some of the gems of your collection, which will, I expect, in a few years be

really widely used. I feel rather strongly that, if you do not overhaul the terminology at this stage, it will be far more troublesome to do so later, and the applicability of the new designs will suffer.

Yours sincerely,