

22 July 1930.

Prof. Dr W. Weinberg,  
Hohenstaufenstrasse, 7,  
STUTTGART,  
Germany.

Dear Prof. Weinberg,

I am very glad to hear from you again, and hope that your interesting researches are making good progress.

The first point raised by your letter concerning the variance of  $\hat{\rho}$  estimated from the formula

$$\frac{\hat{\rho}}{1-\hat{\rho}^k} = \frac{\bar{x}}{k}$$

which is derived from the hypothesis that the frequency of observation of families with  $x$  defectives out of  $k$  is

$$p_x = \frac{k!}{(k-x)! x!} \rho^x (1-\rho)^{k-x} \div (1 - (1-\rho)^k)$$

$$x = 1, 2, \dots, k.$$

If  $n_x$  is the number of such families observed I maximise

$$\sum n_x \log p_x$$

for variations of  $\rho$ , and obtain

$$\sum n_x \left\{ \frac{x}{\rho} - \frac{k-x}{1-\rho} - \frac{k \rho^{k-1}}{1-\rho^k} \right\} = 0$$

L.

or

$$\sum n_x \left( x - \beta k - \frac{\beta k q^k}{1 - q^k} \right) = 0$$

or writing

$$\sum n_x x = \bar{x} \sum n_x$$

we have the solution

$$\bar{x} = k \left\{ \beta + \frac{\beta q^k}{1 - q^k} \right\} = \frac{k\beta}{1 - q^k}$$

To find the variance of  $\beta$  so estimated, I differentiate (I) with respect to  $\beta$ , and equate the result to

$$-\frac{1}{V(\beta)}, \text{ putting } n_x = n_k \beta^x.$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum n_x \left\{ \frac{x}{\beta^2} + \frac{k-x}{q^2} - \frac{k(k-1)q^{k-2}}{1-q^k} - \frac{k^2 q^{2(k-1)}}{(1-q^k)^2} \right\} \\ & = -n_k \left\{ \frac{q^2 - \beta^2}{\beta^2 q^2} \bar{x} + \frac{k}{q^2} - \frac{kq^{k-2}}{(1-q^k)^2} (k-1 + q^k) \right\} \\ & = -n_k \left\{ \frac{(q^2 - \beta^2)\beta}{\beta^2 q^2} + \frac{(1-q^k)}{q^2} - \frac{q^{k-2}}{1-q^k} (k-1 + q^k) \right\} \frac{k}{1-q^k} \\ & = -n_k \left\{ \frac{1 - \beta q^{k-1}}{\beta q} - \frac{q^{k-2}}{1-q^k} (k-1 + q^k) \right\} \frac{k}{1-q^k} \\ & = -\frac{k n_k}{\beta q (1-q^k)^2} \left\{ 1 - kq^{k-1} + (k-1)q^k \right\} \end{aligned}$$

giving the variance formula required.

Many thanks for pointing out the mistake on p. 325

of my "Mathematical Foundations". I expect you have noticed on p. 329 that  $x$  is printed for  $w$  on line 13.

I do not think the formula

$$\beta^{x-\frac{1}{2}} (1-\beta)^{y-\frac{1}{2}} d\beta$$

is any more wrong than  $\beta^x (1-\beta)^y d\beta$  ; the point is

that both are arbitrary, and each may be justified by the appropriate a priori assumption.

The paper is an attempt to lay the foundations of a theory free from all assumptions of this kind.

Yours sincerely,

R. A. Fisher