LETTER

Reply to Comments of D. C. Crocker

Sir:

A complete, point by point discussion of Mr. Crocker's reaction to our two articles is neither desirable nor necessary. Insofar as his criticisms remain objective, we appreciate his comments [I&EC, 62 (6), 5 (1970)].

Our articles were written from the viewpoint of the chemist or chemical engineer with the practical need to make decisions based on the interpretation of his data. Our first "Would You Believe article, 99.996% Explained?" was based on an actual case history in which some of the follies of a proposed statistical analysis were illustrated by using randomly drawn numbers in the suggested scheme. Our second paper, "Pitfalls of Stepwise Regression" illustrates, also with numbers "drawn from a hat," the interrelationships among various common methods of statistical analysis. These articles were both written to help bridge the communications gap between the practicing chemist or chemical engineer and the statistician. It seems apparent that this effort was not 100% successful.

One or two specific points may deserve comment. With regard to the criticism of "picking the tallest person...," it should be pointed out that this is common practice when using this analysis, as implied by the name, stepwise regression. This is one of our principal objections to the procedure.

Further, we would paraphrase Mr. Crocker's statement about 99% of the problems being outside the pale of laboratory control by asserting that seldom can the solutions to real problems in the chemical industry be found by gathering up old data from the daily logs of the plant and running regressions on them. The EVOP techniques proposed by Box (1) represent an alternate (and orthogonal) method for determining cause and effect relationships in a production plant.

We are grateful for the insight provided in the elucidation of the α and β probabilities and we hope that other "statistical novices" will benefit as well.

One point should be made clear to our readers. If the "experiment" from the Pitfalls article had been presented as "real," dealing with such variables as temperature, pressure, catalyst concentration, etc., no fault would be found with the interpretation that the D variable showed an effect at the 95% confidence level while the other variables and interactions showed considerably less significant effects. There is no suggestion in the "data" themselves that they were not obtained from "real" experiments. Except for our assertion that the "data" resulted from random drawing, there is no basis for labeling the acceptance (or rejection) of the null hypothesis as correct or incorrect.

Thus, the dilemma of the experimentalist remains unsolved, in spite of Mr. Crocker's criticisms. On the other hand, we suggest again, perhaps still naively, that one can gain insight into the nature of a proposed analysis technique by making a "blank" run in the manner described.

REFERENCE

(1) Box, G. E. P., "Evolutionary Operation: A Method for Increasing Industrial Productivity," Appl. Statis., VI (2), 1-23 (1957).

Robert A. Stowe Senior Research Chemist Hydrocarbons and Monomers Research Lab 677 Building, The Dow Chemical Co. Midland, Mich. 48640

Raymond P. Mayer Professor of Science and Mathematics West Shore Community College Scottville, Mich. 49454

APPLIED KINETICS

and chemical reaction engineering



This is the third of a series of state-of-the-art books growing out of summer symposia sponsored jointly by I&EC and the Division of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry.

The 15 papers from the 1966 symposium which were published from September 1966 to June 1967 in INDUSTRIAL AND ENGINEERING CHEMISTRY are combined in this book.

Reaction engineering, with its focus on the chemical transformation itself, lays some claim to being the discipline that uniquely differentiates chemical engineering from other branches of engineering. The recently developing interest in reaction analysis has served to reorient chemical engineering research toward the reaction itself and increasingly to consider unit operations from the viewpoint of their interaction with the chemical transformation. This book offers much to the engineering researcher and reactor designer as well as the practicing chemical engineer.

Robert L. Gorring and Vern W. Weekman of the Systems Research Division of Mobil Oil

Corporation and co-chairmen of the syl	mposium,
contributed the introduction. Chapter to	tles
and the authors appear below:	
Mixing and Contacting In Chemical Reactors Kenneth B. Bischoff	
Kinetic Considerations in Surface Catalysis John H. Sinfelt	
Photochemical Reaction Engineering A. E. Cassano, P. L. Silveston, and J. M. Smith	
Reaction Mechanisms for Engineering Design Hugh M. Hulburt and Y. G. Kim	
Is Sophistication Really Necessary? Rutherford Aris	
Disguised Kinetics James Wei	
Surface Models in Heterogeneous Catalysis Giuseppe Parravano	
Yield in Chemical Reactor Engineering James J. Carberry	
Acetylene and Hydrogen from the Pyrolysis of John Happel and Leonard Kramer	of Methane
Reaction Rate Modeling in Heterogeneous Ca J. R. Kittrell and R. Mezaki	italysis
Segregation Effects in Pseudolaminar Flow R W. M. Edwards and D. I. Saletan	eactors
The Theory of Oscillating Reactions Joseph Higgins	
The Concept of Diffusion in Chemical Kinetic Thor A. Bak and Edward R. Fisher	8
Stochastic Mixing Models for Chemical React F. J. Krambeck, R. Shinnar, and S. Katz	tors
Turbulent Heat Transfer to a Nonequilibrium Chemically Reacting Gas P. L. T. Brian and S. W. Bodman	1
To order, fill out the coupon below AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY	
Special Issues Sales / 1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W. / Washington, D. C. 20036	
Please sendcopies of Applied Kinetics and Che Engineering at \$7.50 each,	mical Reactio
224 pages (9 x 12) with Index. Clothbound. (3rd I&EC Division Summer Symposium)	An I&EC Reprin
Check enclosed (to American Chemical Society),	Send bil
NAME	
MAILING ADDRESS	···········