ICI

**Imperial
Chemical
Industries
Limited**

**Organics
Division**

makers of dyestuffs,
pigments, industrial
and polyurethane
chemicals

Mr.R.G.Kuehni,
Mobay Chemical Corporation,
P.O.Box 385,
Union Metropolitan Park,
Union, N.J.07083,
USA.

Your ref	Our ref	Tel ext	Date
RGK:AMV	AR.TS/T/KMcL/BS		6 February, 1976.

Dear Mr.Kuehni,

As expected I found the Kuehni and Metropolitan Section data
awaiting my return and it is at present being entered into a data file for
optimisation studies: many thanks.

I was sorry to hear you say I had "mis-quoted" you at Williamsburg:
if I did it was quite unintentional and I would like you to correct me so
that I don't do it again! The figure I quoted for your optimised equation
for the D&F data, 0.75, was taken from your 1971 J.C.A. paper and I am not
aware of any later publication quoting a higher one.

Some years ago I put $K_1 = 1$ in the FMC-2 equation and if my memory
serves me correctly it brought r down to about the same level as FMC-1.
Although I don't question your evidence concerning the independance of ellipse
size on lightness, it cannot be a coincidence that FMC-1 is always below FMC-2
in ranking order for all acceptability data has been analysed.
which / *Specify with K 1 /*

One point of disagreement that I did'nt raise because of shortage of
time was the acceptability/perceptibility question. My evidence seems to
prove conclusively that shade passers are biased against hue differences because
for each set of acceptability data the optimum hue weighting is greater than the
optimum lightness weighting - between 1.3 and 5.3 times greater whereas for each
set of perceptibility data (MMB & Robertson) it is less - 0.5 to 0.6.

Needless to say my fingers will be crossed until the figures for the
Kuehni - Metropolitan data have been obtained.

With kindest regards,

Yours sincerely,

K.McLaren

**THE QUEEN'S AWARD
TO INDUSTRY**
1966 1968 1969 1971 1975