

November 18, 1940

My dear Taylor,

I have just got yours of the 16th and should be delighted if you were able to come over either here or to make a meeting in town.

I have rescored the 15 published sets of titrations, including the queries, which I suppose the printer made trouble about. As I expected, these do appreciably improve the precision, though the <sup>correspondence</sup> comparison using <sup>cells</sup> ~~cell~~ of different types, as in these cases, seems never to be quite so close ~~is~~ as the original data in which the <sup>cells</sup> ~~cell~~ used were all, or nearly all, ~~A~~  $A_1$ .

I have one query already, which perhaps you or someone in your Department could look into, referring to the two sets of titrations marked Burgess & Dundee and Scott and Dundee. In these two cases the third column is shorter than the second, which I do not think occurs elsewhere, and I wonder whether possibly  $A_1B$  has been recorded in the second column and  $A_2$  in the third, i.e., these two columns may have been reversed relative to the convention used for other sera.

Yours sincerely