



AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE

1271 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS

NEW YORK 20, N. Y.

April 19, 1962

L. C. BURROUGHS
CONSULTANT

OFFICERS

M. J. RATHBONE, CHAIRMAN OF BOARD
FRANK M. PORTER, PRESIDENT
V. A. BELLMAN, VICE PRESIDENT
A. P. FRAME, VICE PRESIDENT
GAGE LUND, VICE PRESIDENT
A. O. SAVAGE, VICE PRESIDENT
HENDERSON SUPPLEE, JR., VICE PRESIDENT
P. C. SPENCER, TREASURER
WILLARD M. WILSON, SECRETARY

Dr. John H. Ludwig, Chief
Laboratory of Engineering and
Physical Sciences
Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center
4676 Columbia Parkway
Cincinnati 26, Ohio

Dear John:

With regard to Hofreuter, et al, report on the blood-lead studies in Philadelphia, my comments would closely follow those outlined in Don Diggs' letter of April 13, 1962.

In addition, I should like to comment that the reader is likely to become confused by the intermingling of what is significant from mathematical treatment and health standpoints.

The opening statement that the "investigations be undertaken to evaluate the public health significance" is followed by an extended analysis of statistical significance. There is a sentence on the first page and a sentence on the last page indicating that the difference in the blood lead concentrations of the various groups studied do not have health significance.

In a mathematical sense the word "significant" is defined and has meaning. Outside this field the bare word "significant" is vague and implies importance without stating why or how important. In my opinion more accurate and descriptive terms should be used in scientific writing to define the degree of importance of a finding. The expression "is significant because" would, of course, be acceptable.

The material in the report could easily be reorganized to avoid misunderstanding on the part of the reader.

Yours sincerely,

LCB:rp
cc: V. H. Castrop D. R. Diggs ✓
H. Hesselberg R. A. Kehoe
J. A. Maga C. L. Samuelson ✓
R. O. McCaldin ✓

KE 0004722