

III. Observations on the Biometric Report and the
Chalmers Editorial

At the outset, it should be noted that the authors of the Biometric report do not claim to be qualified to appraise the clinical aspects of the UGDP study. The Biometric report states: "The choice of specific selections criteria adopted by the UGDP was a responsibility that was shared with medical experts and is not a topic on which this committee as a whole claims primary competence." This disavowal of clinical competence was well taken, as will be seen below.

The Biometric report recognizes that "the result of [the UGDP] decision to terminate the study [is to] leave us with some residual uncertainty as to the meaning of the findings."

The report further states, "We discovered a puzzling anomaly concerning the distribution of the two sexes in the four treatment groups within clinics... The discrepancy in Seattle alone would represent an unusual event in random allocation... A more important point is whether these findings provide evidence of a breakdown of the randomization