

18th. March 1949.

Dear Richardson,

Thanks for your letter, which I am returning herewith at your request.

I do not believe your method is right technically, though I have no doubt your conclusion is justified. One point, I think a minor one, is that your data ignore the age of the rabbits dying and not dying respectively. Accepting this limitation as necessary, I think what you should say, for example on the first occasion, is:-

<u>Charles.</u>		<u>Non-Charles.</u>	
<u>Exposed to risk</u>	<u>Deaths</u>	<u>Exposed to risk</u>	<u>Deaths</u>
5	0	15	1

Entries of this kind could be added up, and give a valid test of significance. I presume that an observer might make up the table once a week, so as to give an exposure to risk measured truly in respect of time. The next complication he would have added would be that of age, but this perhaps we have agreed to ignore.

Yours sincerely,