

**REPLY TO SOME COMMENTS ON
THE SURVEY OF THE PREVALENCE OF SYPHILIS
IN A RAILWAY COLONY, LUCKNOW**

Sir,

The material for the paper was condensed from the Thesis submitted for M. D. in Social and Preventive Medicine under my guidance and supervision by the postgraduate student Dr. O. P. Kapoor. The work was done independently by Dr. Kapoor as is required under the regulations for M. D. Examination. Statistical assistance and guidance was taken when and where considered necessary.

No sampling frame-work was envisaged in the study. Complete coverage of the families was attempted, and 71.0 per cent of the families could be examined. Thus there was a non-response to the extent of 29 per cent. This was high in the Type I category of accommodation. Since stratification by type of accommodation was not done analysis is made as if simple random sampling was done. The bias introduced due to non-response has not been considered.

The occupation categories are well-defined in the Railways and were used for comparison within the Railway communities. As shown by Dr. Rao they can be grouped into broader suggested recognised categories.

The total income is an indication of economic well-being but the amount available for expenditure per head is a better index. The per capita income, therefore, has been used than the total income, as it takes into consideration the size of the family.

The horizontal percentages have been calculated to show category specific rates of prevalence. This allows for comparison between categories (age, etc.) as the 'population at risk' is taken into consideration for each category.

B. G. PRASAD
