25th April, 1956.

Dear Michael,

Thanks for your completed table, which seems to be a fine job of work. For what they are worth, which is little, I have two last-figure corrections, as I had worked the case for one degree of freedom with high accuracy. One which comes repeatedly is 31.82052 in place of 31.82051, the more exact value being 31.8205159 for the 2% value.

The other is at 45° only in the 1.1 table, i.e. one of the few numbers not repeated, and is 90.02423 in place of 22 for the last two figures, the more accurate value being 22.67.

I am not in a position to make such trifling corrections, even if they were needed, in the other parts of the table, and I am sure that no trouble should be given to polishing up the last figure, which is always waste of time. In my opinion, to present five decimals is merely to offer a table which, in the author's opinion, is more accurate than would be an exact table rounded to four figures. There are, however, a lot of fanatics much concerned that one should make a tabular error of -.49 instead of one of +.51.
I am rearranging your table with these two modifications, so as to correspond with what I think were Frank's intentions for "Statistical Tables", i.e. bringing together values for different levels of significance which would be needed together to compare with an observed value, instead of, as you have done, putting together entries by the comparison of which the accuracy of the table may best be judged.

Thank you much for all your cares.

Sincerely yours,