

13 June 1932.

A.D. Buchanan Smith, Esq.,
Institute of Animal Genetics,
King's buildings,
West Mains Road,
EDINBURGH.

Dear Buchanan Smith :

You are certainly right about the twentieth, but after the first sentence your paragraph about it grows obscure. I suggest altering possibility to probability and finishing the paragraph as below:-

Tables of the normal curve, which as Dr. Wishart admits are for such large samples sufficiently accurate, show that a deviation of -1.64σ leaves only one twentieth of the area to the left of that point. The fact that there is also a second twentieth to the right of the point $+1.64\sigma$ is irrelevant, since positive deviations however great could not be cited in support of sex linkage. The distinction is a simple one though frequently overlooked by others besides Mr. Edwards and Dr. Wishart.^[*] The point is fully explained by Fisher (Statistical Methods for Research Workers, 3rd. Ed. p. 45).

Yours sincerely,

[* Nature 129, 867, (1932)]