

19th. December 1949.

Dear Henningsen,

It is exceedingly kind of you to send me your offprints, which I have been looking at with great interest. Yours is, so far as I know, the first work on this interesting factor sufficiently thorough to provide a basis for our further understanding of the genetic situation.

Looking at your Table 5 of 183 families with 508 children, I believe one could push the interpretation a step further by estimating the proportion of individuals serologically classifiable as Pstr., Pmed. and Pw. respectively who are genetically heterozygous for the supposedly unique gene p.

Beyond what you publish this would only require listing the number of children in the families (i.e. the number of children actually tested and recorded in the Table) for 18 lists of families made by subdividing the 9 classes in Table 5 into those which do not and those which do contain at least one recessive child.

If there are n children in a family, the chance that if both parents are heterozygous there will be at least one recessive child is

$$(1 - (\frac{1}{4})^n) .$$

This quantity added for the values of g occurring in one of your sub-lists, such as Patr. x Patr., gives the number of families with a recessive child to be expected in this group, and, dividing the observed number by this expectation, we should obtain an estimate of p^2 , where p is the probability that an individual classified as Patr. shall be heterozygous.

Similarly the other 9 classes will provide estimates from which an idea could be formed as to whether consistent estimates for p, q and r, the proportions heterozygous in the three serological classes, are likely to be possible, and, if so, what approximately their values are.

Of course this is only a preliminary reconnaissance required to obtain such approximate values and, for example, to see whether the assumption that all Pw. persons were heterozygous would be compatible with the data. With this guidance it might seem worthwhile to do a more professional and efficient fitting, using the principle of maximum likelihood and the method of scoring in some such way as I have illustrated in "The fitting of gene frequencies to data on Rhesus reactions" and "Note on the calculation of the frequencies of Rhesusallelomorphs", of which I am sending you offprints.

Of course, if you would care to send me the lists of numbers of children in each family, I could perhaps find time to get the job done, or at least sufficiently advanced to report to you, during next term, when I shall be at the University of Toronto.

Yours sincerely,