

Dr. H. R. F. F.

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
PASADENA

WILLIAM G. KERCKHOFF LABORATORIES
OF THE BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

28 rd. March 1938

Dear Professor,

Two days ago I dispatched ^{and to the present} to Mr. Douie notice of my intention to resign from the College at the end of this session, which I suppose is September 30th. I have definitely taken the John Innes job now. I expect that you will not be surprised that I have done this in view of our various conversations on the possibility last year. I shall of course be sorry to leave the Galton Laboratory, but the advantages of the other job, notably the financial advantages are not to be overlooked. I hope and expect, however, that I shall be a frequent visitor to the Galton Lab., and that we may continue our collaboration on Lythrum. As far as I can see the Lythrum project will be helped by the fact that I shall be in a position to get ^clargish numbers of plants grown at Merton.

I should very much like to have your advice on the question of some work I have been doing. You will no doubt remember Smith's pet project of working out a method for the exact use of F_3 segregations in families carrying polymeric factors, and his various attempts to solve the problem. I suggested that one way might be to postulate linkage between two of the factors and thus get a continuously varying set of segregations in F_2 and F_3 . By this means one could find the deviation of the maximised log likelihood expression from 0, and divide its square by the amount of information about the recombination fraction to obtain a χ^2 , when one of the two values, 0 or $\frac{1}{2}$, was used for p , the recombination fraction. Thus one could get an exact test of significance for deviations from either or both of two possible numbers of polymeric factors. I have been working on this to some extent while here and have got the method of calculation worked out. In as much as the likelihood expression for any F_3 family must take into account the possibility of the F_2 plant having been of a number of different types, it is not possible, as far as I can see, ^{surely} to get the log. likelihood expression. This is not a real difficulty, ~~however~~, as the deviation from the maximised log likelihood expression can be obtained in terms

of the likelihood and its first derivative. Similarly the amount of information can be obtained from the likelihood and its derivatives. The^{re} is, on the other, hand considerable labour necessary to obtain the derivatives of the likelihood expression and even more labour to compute them for a largeish number of F_{23} s even when some chosen value, 0 or $\frac{1}{2}$, is substituted for p . The question at the moment is this, I have shown to my own satisfaction that the problem is capable of solution in terms of linkage, and I have also shown that the computational labour is very large, ^{but} is the problem worth the labour? I find it difficult to judge as having sunk some time into it I feel reluctant to throw it away but hesitate to sink even more time into it unless the expenditure will be well made. The calculation for 4 factors, two of them linked, i.e. the case for distinguishing 3 from 4 polymeric genes, is, at least to me, quite heavy going, though the cases of 1 or 2 factors, and 2 or 3 were not too awful. I have decided not to do any more till I hear your opinion.

I have been raising an enormous number of flies in an effort to solve the riddle of why certain left ends of the X chromosome appear in only half as many flies as they should. I have got a lot of figures but not much sense out of it yet. It definitely appears not to be due to interaction of the left end with either an autosomal gene or a free fragment. I must have a concentrated think about the figures once more but I really feel bogged at the moment. It is very intriguing indeed.

I am just running some more experiments on crossing-over in homozygous inversions. If they come out alright, without any bad abnormalities in segregation, they should be very valuable from the point of view of position determination such as I have written about in the past.

I have also fixed a lot of maize meiosis from trisomies and their sister diploids in the hope of finding out whether trisomy affects the negative correlation, if maize has one, between the chiasma frequencies of the different bivalents. I shall work this up at Harvard. Incidentally I have deferred my advent in Harvard until the end of May.

I had a letter from Brandt and shall call on him in Washington on my way to Harvard. Dobzhansky is now in Mexico collecting more *Drosophila*, but otherwise there is no news from here. I had a rather hectic argument with

Dobzhansky about his book, which you may have seen. I did think that he missed much of the point of your writings on the subject and his interpretation of Herland's cotton was little short of scandalous. However, the book seems to be so much in advance of any other simple account of its kind that I feel that in spite of some flaws of this kind, it was well worth while. In comparison with, say, Watkins presentation it is positively classical. I should like to hear your opinion on it.

I must close now as we are going to see the lion farm at El Monte this afternoon. Sturtevant says they have a gene for albinism in ^e those lions as he has seen litters throwing albinos there. I hope I see some of them. There are no albino cats, are there?

Mrs Mather joins me in sending best wishes to you and Mrs. Fisher.

Yours,

K. Mather