

B

July 24, 1941

Dear Peters,

Thanks for your letter. I have not worked over the further data you send, though I hope to do so some time.

I do not think there is any point in increasing the number of samples taken before treatment so as to match the number taken after treatment. What is used in covariance is the total count for each sheep, using as many as were made before treatment. The regression coefficient was, on one occasion at least, about half, so there would be no harm if only half as many pre-treatments were taken per sheep as those taken after treatment, e.g., 3 and 6 respectively.

There is, of course, no minimum number of sheep, as no minimum precision can be laid down. In the experiment with 18 lambs you had in effect 6 sheep for each treatment, although the absolute replicates were only two. If the experiment adopted is one with hidden replication of this kind, we may get the same advantage again. I suppose an experiment with 30 sheep in all would be manageable at most centres, and these should be allocable, so as to give adequate replication on the more crucial points. light

Naturally I shall be very much interested to hear what ~~line~~ the

further experimentati^o~~on~~ you mention throws on the action of the drug.

Yours sincerely,