From: Jones, Prof D.R. [Code A]
Sent: 24 June 2003 15:22
To: [Code A]
Subject: Gosport draft comments

Richard:

I read the draft as promised - more precisely, I skimmed it all, and read chapters 4 and 7 + summary and conclusions etc more carefully. Overall, it was very clear, with sources and analyses clearly indicated, and conclusions easily traceable to these. I found hardly any typos. I have a few specific comments, none of which is absolutely critical to fix, though naturally I think they are all worth attention:

1 Summary. I agree this is too long for many purposes, though it is clearly structured for the most part. My suggestion (apart from reduction) is that the recommendations be split into thosespecific to this case (1 and 2) and more general ones (3,4,5).

2 One recurrent typo/inconsistency is that of 'ward' for 'Ward' were a named ward is concerned. (ie sometimes given as 'ward', sometimes 'Ward').

3 Somewhat similar, but more serious (in my view!) are two points of stats presentation: the usual recommndation is that results be stated in the form (Chi sq = 34.5, df =5;p = 0.002). Yours are stated slightly variably, with degrees of freedom omitted, and sometimes with ' p<0.000', which isn't correct. To avoid making too big adeal of this I'd suggest you add in df=n except where df=1, and that you change the above to p<0.001 (or some smaller value if true).

4 on p55 immediately above subheading I'd add 'using true holiday data' (or something similar) after 'repeated'

5 on p56 3rd para it would be desirable to indicate that expected numbers of certs are calculated using control practice cert rate.

6 tables 6.3 and following:
 a) rates are rates/1000
b) 8th column is O-E RATES, which is unusual (O-E are usually numbers) but also possibly redundant - what is this used for?
c) final row = total of O-E, and should probably be so labelled.

Hope this is clear and helpful.

Regards

David Jones

PS am now expecting 2 profiles to assess.