December 7, 1942

Dear Fraser Roberts,

If I follow the logical position rightly in the work you have in view, I do not think the test of combined significance adds to the weight to be attached to the individual items of which it is composed in the sense that "one can conclude that the significant differences are real, and not due to artificial classification", though it does seem to exclude the focussing of attention on certain age groups only in the sense of counting the successes and ignoring the failures.

It was the use of unfair inuendo by the Lancet reviewer that annoyed me, e.g., mightly or wrongly, Ford proposed some new notation. It was not a new notation that I felt any particular need for; but, as an experienced teacher, it seems one of the most normal and proper things which he should do in writing a text-book. The reviewer's insinuation on this implies that he was ignorant of what he was doing, and that the new notation was a complete solecism. I do not know who he was, but he seems clearly to be the sort of writer that may need to be checked.

Yours sincerely,