Dear Dr Smith,

Thanks for your letter and the article, which I will pass through for publication in the *Annals*. I think it is good from everybody's point of view to have these very remarkable data put on record.

William has just shown me an analysis of the children of long but divided according to the mother, which confirms the entire insignificance of any maternal influence on age at death, which I was inclined to infer from King Chulalongkorn's data, omitting the infants. I suppose it may be that some medical disabilities would exclude a queen from the royal harem which would not disqualify a king. Except for this kind of possibility, I find it most puzzling that such great differences within the family as are shown between the two kings examined should not also leave some trace on the mother's side.

I am extremely glad you have set out histograms comparing
the three kings for which you have data. There is one point which might be made clear, which also affects the tables, in which there are a number of children said to have died at the age of 1, and I think none in the more dangerous period between birth and the first anniversary of the birthday. On the charts I see that you note "20 children died in the first year of life" and I suppose really these are 20 out of the 30 shown in the chart as dying 1-5. A reader taking you literally would interpret this note as meaning that, in addition to those shown, there were also 20 children dying in the first year of life, and if this is your intention no modification of the note on the chart is called for. Otherwise you ought to explain how you have treated deaths in early infancy.

Yours sincerely,