

7 Bell Road
Hampstead N.W. 3
June 20 1922

Dear Professor Kelley,

I think you have got the grip of the enclosed problem. Your method of proof is very nearly the same as mine & at any rate as good. I have been very busy recently with examinations, but should like to develop the result by making the combated quantities

$$\text{not } X = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i p) \quad \& \quad Y = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i p')$$
$$\text{but } X = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i p) + m \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i p')$$
$$Y = m' \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i p') + l' \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i p'')$$

The $x_p, x_{p'}, x_{p''}$ being given in the same manner. This to follow up our talk of a day or two ago

and see how constants like m or
 m' and l' would give a different
correlation between X & Y to that
reached by changing the size
of S .

Yours very sincerely
Karl Pearson.