feeding on *E. amabilis* larva either with or without cocoon.

In this controversy we had tried to avoid mention of exceptional cases but since Mahdihassan refuses to be convinced and stand corrected and since due to work of more practical importance in hand it may not be possible for us to publish a detailed paper on *E. tachardiæ* in the near future, we might state for the information of the readers that in the last twelve years, only in four instances we have come across *E. tachardiæ* parasitising *M. greeni* larva in the field prior to spinning a cocoon. In these cases, the damaged lac, covering the *E. amabilis* larva evidently also served the purpose of *M. greeni* cocoon for the *E. tachardiæ*. Because all that the chalcid needs, besides a supply of food to its young, is a protection for its egg or eggs, and when the chalcid did not easily find a mature *M. greeni* larva in cocoon, it laid eggs on the pre-cocoon larval stage of *M. greeni*. In such cases the laboratory examination and observations go to show that the *E. tachardiæ* larva after devouring the *M. greeni* larvæ on which it developed attacks even the unparasitised *M. greeni* larvæ if they are present and in the absence of these, the larva goes on biting here and there on the remains of E. *amabilis* larva which is contaminated with the smell of its host (*M. greeni* larvæ). If Mahadihassan is quite sure of his observation then his solitary observation would probably fall under the above-mentioned category. A careful examination in such cases, however, always reveals the presence of the empty egg shells, shrivelled eggs and larval moults of *M. greeni* on the remains of *E. amabilis* larva or its surroundings.

P. S. Negi.
S. N. Gupta.

Indian Lac Research Institute,
Namkum,
December 20, 1937.

[1] *Curr. Sci.*, 1937, **6**, 59-63.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1935, **4**, 37-39.

The Distribution of the Mean Fisher's t^2.

Mr. K. Raghavan Nair has recently made some comments[1] on my paper entitled "The distribution of the mean of Fisher's t^2 for samples from a normal population".[2]

So far as I am aware (1) the relation between the ratio of variances between and within samples and the average of the t^2's and (2) the nature of the distribution of the mean of a number of independent t^2's based on a common variance have not been given anywhere else.

The illustration given on page 530 was not intended to be new, but merely to illustrate the use of the previous formula given in the paper.

Mr. Nair has not caught my point for the case where the groups differ. Here my point is that the usual method of working out the sum of squares for calculation of significances breaks down owing to non-orthogonality, and that t^{-2} method is helpful in such cases.

The objections raised in the last two paragraphs are not tenable, because the experimenter who will be anxious to get as much information from the data as is possible will surely take into consideration the significance of the differences between the various possible combinations of the 'p' treatments, and it is but natural that a combined test for all these treatments should be based on some function of these t^2's. In the present case, I have suggested the mean of all these t^2's as the basis for the combined test. The distribution of this mean, as it involves only $(p-1)$ independent comparisons can be taken to be the one shown in the paper.

P. V. Krishnaier.

Imperial Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi,
January 29, 1938.

[1] *Curr. Sci.*, 1937, **6**, 290.

[2] *Proc. Ind. Acad. Sci.*, (A), 1937, **5**, 528.