

12th September, 1951.

My dear Cyril,

Thanks for your note. I am returning Dawson's, as I have already written to him about his problem. About numbers of decimal places, an awful lot of past work where the author was careless or inhibited about giving additional decimal places beyond what are statistically significant has been a frightful nuisance, and the present generation is, I presume, learning over the other way. It facilitates checking such as may well be needed in combination with later data, or comparison, is required. I should find it very difficult to give a good reason for cutting such percentages down a couple of figures, even in cases where, for my own purposes, I should consider the smaller number enough.

Sincerely yours,