ST. THOMAS'S HOSPITAL MEDICAL SCHOOL,
LONDON, S.E.1.

W. W. HOLLAND, M.D., B.Sc.
READER

TELEPHONE : WATERLOO 9292 Ext.2010

WWH/JAA

16th August, 1966

Dear Henry,

Many thanks indeed for sending me the readings of the E.C.G.s. I now enclose a tabulation of the comparison between the readings of your people, labelled HB, and of the London School of Hygiene readers (LSH) The sample which was sent to you consisted of those labelled as having 1.1 or 1.2 abnormalities, plus a random sample of the remainder. You will see from this that the agreement for 1.1 or 1.2 is not quite as good as one might have hoped. If one however looks at probable or possible ischaemia, the agreement is not too bad. It implies that E.C.G. readers still require more standardisation.

Many thanks indeed also for your most recent article which is most interesting.

With all good wishes and kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

Walli.

W.W. Holland, M.D.,B.Sc.

Dr. H. Blackburn,
University of Minnesota,
School of Public Health,
Laboratory of Physiological Hygiene,
Stadium Gate, 27,
Minneapolis,
Minnesota 55455,
U.S.A.

c.c: Dr. R.W. Stone,
Dr. G. Rose.

Correlation of E.C.G. Interpretations

by London School of Hygiene and Minnesota

		L.S.H.		
		1.1-3 or 4.1-3 or 5.1-3 or 7.1	Not any of these	
Minnesota	1.1-3 or 4.1-3 or 5.1-3 or 7.1	24	3	27
	Not any of these	5	23	28
		29	26	55

Agreement = 85.4%.

Correlation of E.C.G. Interpretations

by London School of Hygiene and Minnesota

		L.S.H.		
		1.1 or 1.2	Not any of these	
Minnesota	1.1 or 1.2	16	0	16
	Not any of these	10	29	39
		26	29	55

Agreement = 81.8%.

Comparison of E.C.G. Interpretations

Washington

LSH

1.0 1.1 1.2

Mm	L.S.H.	H.B.
006	1.1, 4.2, 5.1, 8.1	1.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.3
033	1.0	5.3
046	1.0	1.0
051	9.1	1.0
066	1.2, 8.7	1.3-(1), 8.7
072	1.0	1.0
079	1.2, 9.1	1.0
095	1.2, 5.3	1.0
096	1.2	1.2-(4)
097	1.0	1.0
103	1.0	1.0
110	1.0	7.3
124	1.0	1.0
158	1.0	1.0
159	1.2, 5.3, 7.3	5.3, 6.3
160	1.0	4.2, 5.3
162	1.2	9.8
167	1.2, 2.1	1.2-(6), 2.1
187	1.2, 8.7	6.5, 8.7
202	1.0	1.0
203	1.0	1.0
227	1.2, 4.3, 5.5	1.3-(2), 4.2, 5.2, 6.8
234	1.2	1.2, 4.4

Comparison of E.C.G. Interpretations

Baltimore

	L.S.H.	H.B.
019	1.2, 5.3	1.2-(6), 5.3
034	1.0	1.0
051	5.3	4.3, 5.3
054	1.2	1.3-(1)
055	1.0	1.0
058	1.0	1.0
090	1.0	1.0
118	1.1, 2.1, 7.1	1.1-(1), 4.2, 5.2
124	1.2, 3.1, 4.3	1.3-(3), 7.4
141	1.0	1.0
160	1.0	1.0
175	1.2, 2.1, 4.1, 5.2	1.2-(7), 2.1, 4.1, 5.2
182	1.0	1.0
183	1.2, 5.2	1.2-(4), 5.2
184	7.3, 8.1, 8.9	8.1
185	1.2, 7.2, 8.7, 9.1	1.1-(1), 7.1
187	1.0	1.0
201	1.2	1.2-(4)
212	1.0	1.0
273	1.1, 4.2, 5.1	1.2-(8), 4.2, 5.1
277	1.1, 5.2	1.1-(1), 5.2
285	1.2, 8.1	1.2-(4), 8.1

Comparison of E.C.G. Interpretations

Westchester

	L.S.H.	H.B.
33	1.1, 2.1	1.1-(6), 7.4
49	1.0	1.0
75	1.1, 4.2, 5.2, 8.7, 9.9	1.2-(4), 4.1, 5.2, 8.7
96	1.0	1.0
102	1.1, 5.2, 11.1, 9.3	1.1-(6), 5.2
130	1.0	1.0
159	1.0	1.0
175	1.2, 9.3	1.3-(2)
214	1.2	1.0
2.5	1.0	1.0