Dear Tucker,

Many thanks for your letter and enclosed paper. I still think it would be a good thing if Goodrich would submit it for the Proceedings, where it certainly would come under the eye of comparative anatomists more than in the Annals. In the event of a refusal, the Annals would take it gladly, if they are still in my hands.

I enclose a suggested modification of a couple of sentences on page 5. Perhaps also the sentence in the fourth section of the summary, "Contrary to the description of Danforth's original stock... requires reconsideration.

If I am not mistaken, after receiving the material from Danforth, Dunn backcrossed it repeatedly to an inbred line known as Bagg Albino with a view primarily to comparing its reaction in this standard stock with those of other tail defects which he
had previously treated in the same way. He soon found, what he could not have expected, that the injury caused by 3d in the heterozygotes was greatly enhanced as the backcrossing continued. So much so that it is doubtful if the mutant could be propagated in this stock. Glücksohn-Schönhaimer, working in Dunn’s Department, probably examined material unless she specifies the contrary, from the Fagg albino backcrosses rather than from the stock originally received, of which probably nothing is known in detail. It seems to me likely that in the stock originally received spontaneous selection had largely mitigated the reaction, but that this work was undone to a great extent by the backcrossing in Dunn’s laboratory.

In view of this history, it might be misleading to refer Glücksohn-Schönhaimer’s descriptions to the original stock unless she makes it quite clear that this is so.

As you say, your findings do not affect the significance of the observed response to selection in both directions in my stocks. My
feeling is that there is not sufficient basis for thinking that it might do so to justify an explicit repudiation of this view.

As you know, I had put aside a number of further homozygotes for your use, should you find time to examine any more. I expect, however, that you have satisfied yourself as to the general situation.

I am returning the paper herewith, on which I would like to congratulate you.

Yours sincerely,
Suggested modification in the 4th paragraph on page 5.

Evidently there was none in the homozygotes of the stock examined by Glucksman Schoenheimer, but in the material supplied by Fisher after backcrossing an accumulation of modifying factors has already mitigated the extreme severity of the reaction. Dunn had reported a remarkable intensification of the defect on progressing backcrossing to the inbred Bagg albino stock, and it was with albinoa from these backcrosses that Fisher was supplied. Fisher and Holt demonstrate spontaneous selection in favour of a milder reaction in the course of their experiment, and this spontaneous selection doubtless became very effective immediately after outcrossing.