13 June 1932

Dr. O. Tedin,
   Sveriges Utsädesförening,
     Svalöf,
       Sweden.

My dear Tedin :

Thanks for your letter. I think Immer's advice was
pretty good common sense, and the simple thing would be to
apply it to the actual data.   It is, of course, true,
that the correlation between u and v in your notation is
derivable from that between x and y, if you know also the
variances of x and y; but it seems to have a perfectly
direct meaning in its own right in deciding whether, on
fertile land, with u high, v is any greater than on infertile
land.   Actually the covariance of x+y and x—y must be
the difference between the variance of y and the variance
of x, so that if these variances are equal there is no
doubt that a statement of yield difference is more generally
true than a statement of percentage difference, which could
only be the more accurate if the higher yielder had the
higher variance.   It would be ideal if the coefficients of
variation, but not the variances were really equal.   I think

this point about the covariance of $\underline{u}$ and $\underline{v}$ will put your algebra right, as you have their variances correctly.   I don't see how the regression would help, though the regression on rainfall or temperature might be invaluable practically.

Yours sincerely,