TABLE I

Total Number of Random Pairs Available for the Sequential Analysis and the Final Percentage Scored Positive

Comparison	After 1 month		After 3 months	
	Number of pairs	% positive pairs	Number of pairs	% positive pairs
Chlorpromazine vs. phenobarbital	94	63	60	67
Prochlorperazine vs. phenobarbital	96	70	67	73
Triflupromazine vs. phenobarbital	92	64	56	80
Perphenazine vs. phenobarbital	98	71	63	86
Mepazine vs. phenobarbital	98	53	64	64
Chlorpromazine vs. mepazine	96	65	69	67
Prochlorperazine vs. mepazine	99	65	71	63
Triflupromazine vs. mepazine	90	64	58	81
Perphenazine vs. mepazine	98	72	63	75
Prochlorperazine vs. chlorpromazine	96	51	65	55
Triflupromazine vs. chlorpromazine	90	59	55	71
Perphenazine vs. chlorpromazine	95	55	57	61
Prochlorperazine vs. triflupromazine	90	48	61	38
Perphenazine vs. triflupromazine	90	50	51	47
Perphenazine vs. prochlorperazine	97	57	65	55

to phenobarbital after three months. The number of available pairs was exhausted at a critical moment in this comparison. The final proportion of pairs in favor of mepazine was 0.64; significantly better than chance ($\chi^2 = 5.06$, $p < 0.05$). Thus, this result might be interpreted as being consistent with the covariance analysis, which did show mepazine to be superior to phenobarbital after three months. Figure 8 is similar; prochlorperazine at 63 per cent was another near miss but significant ($\chi^2 = 5.55$, $p < 0.05$). Figure 9 contains the one clear inconsistency with the analysis of covariance. Trifluprazine is shown to be better than chlorpromazine. The final proportion of pairs in favor of trifluprazine was 0.71. The covariance analysis did not distinguish between these two drugs, but inspection of the adjusted means shows that the trifluprazine group had the lowest mean morbidity score after treatment followed by perphenazine, chlorpromazine, prochlorperazine, mepazine, and phenobarbital, in that order. In the other two channels in this figure, perphenazine approached a decision line but no decision was reached in either comparison. The last figure is self-explanatory. Again the serial plot almost reached a decision in favor of trifluprazine over prochlorperazine, but did not disagree with the covariance analysis.

Table I presents the total number of random pairs available for the sequential analysis and the final percentage of them scored positive.

DISCUSSION

Although analysis of variance and this sequential model are quite dissimilar, in that the former tests the significance of the difference between adjusted means whereas the latter