

April 5, 1940

Dear Garwood,

I am sorry that my comments should have given you any trouble, but I cannot agree with the statement in your third paragraph: "The first published reference to the exact method seems to be (3) and it would appear that you gave the solution for the exact method in a personal communication to Bliss". Certainly both Bliss and I at the time supposed the exact method to have been published in 1935, where I pointed out that the use of empirical probits fitted by weighted regression was a large sample approximation, and gave the corresponding small sample method of approaching the maximal likelihood solution.

I do not think there need be any confusion between the establishment of a result as exact for all values of  $g$  and the making of a recommendation, whether based on the size of  $g$  or not, as to whether a large sample approximation is sufficiently accurate for the purpose in hand, or whether small sample methods should be used. *The calculation of the exact method is not possible for all values of g.*

I return your paper herewith,

Yours sincerely,