on Megalo-cornea; by Marque, on Pontine Tumours; and by Barrios, on Pulsating Exophthalmos, some of which we hope to abstract for publication in this Journal.

R. R. JAMES.

Medical Research Committee, Statistical Reports. No. 3. An Analysis of 8,670 Ophthalmic Cases treated at a Home Hospital.

This is a report on the ophthalmic work carried out at the 2nd London General Hospital, St. Mark's College, Chelsea, from September, 1914, to the end of 1917, by Major A. W. Ormond, and is mainly statistical. Of the 8,670 cases dealt with, 5,896 were out-patients sent from various military centres and did not differ much from civilian hospital work. Major Ormond states that the Hospital was a spectacle centre for the distribution of glasses ordered elsewhere, but does not include any account of this work in the report.

The notes include 684 men blinded in the war, divided into two main classes. Those who lost their sight by a transversely passing missile, and those whose eyes were destroyed by the bursting of a shell or bomb close to, with penetration of, the globes. Towards the end of the period dealt with in this report the number of bullet wound cases diminished. The reason for this was given to the author by an officer, who said, “Ah, we have learnt to deal with snipers now.” The author promises to deal with some of the more interesting cases in a later paper. It is satisfactory to hear that there was only one case of sympathetic ophthalmia, and he recovered vision of 6/9 in the sympathizing eye. The result of magnet extraction of foreign bodies was disappointing, but it is to be noted that only the severe cases were sent home, the less serious ones receiving treatment at the base hospitals in France.

In conclusion, we may draw attention to the following somewhat startling misprint which occurs in a note upon plastic operations: “the number of failures were few, the pediculi (sic) being sufficient to sustain the vitality of the graft,” etc.

E. E. H.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A NEW FORM OF BI-FOCAL LENS.

To the Editor of The British Journal of Ophthalmology.

SIR,—Referring to the suggestion made by Mr. E. E. Henderson, concerning the altered effectivity of spherical lenses when tilted, I
should like to submit the accompanying table in the hope that it may prove interesting.

The results have been calculated to six places of decimals but are expressed in terms of the nearest 8th of a dioptre, showing the altered effectivity of the various powers when tilted through 15°, 20°, and 25°.

I am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

J. R. Howard.

41, Wigmore Street,
April 3, 1919.

THE ALTERED EFFECTIVITY OF A SPHERICAL LENS WHEN ROTATED ABOUT ITS HORIZONTAL MERIDIAN.

Calculated from the formulae

\[ D_1 = \frac{D \cdot 2 \mu}{2 \mu - \sin^2 \alpha} \]

\[ D_2 = \frac{D_1}{\cos^2 \alpha} \]

Where

\[ \sin^2 15° = 0.066977 \]
\[ \sin^2 20° = 0.116964 \]
\[ \sin^2 25° = 0.178591 \]

\[ \cos^2 15° = 0.933023 \]
\[ \cos^2 20° = 0.883036 \]
\[ \cos^2 25° = 0.821409 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dioptres</th>
<th>15°</th>
<th>20°</th>
<th>25°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To the Editor of The British Journal of Ophthalmology.

Sir,—I have long been convinced that it is most important that myopes should never rotate their eyes downwards when reading, but that the book should be raised to the level of their eyes as explained on p. 47 of my "Prescribing of Spectacles."

Only last week a myope of -4D. came to me with a detachment of the retina that had occurred the previous day. He had been wearing bifocal lenses. Less than two years ago I had a similar case of -3D. who had a detachment for which also I could assign no cause but that he was wearing bifocal lenses. I feel it my duty to give this warning against bifocals in myopia, though I suppose that I am as enthusiastic as anyone in their praise in cases of hypermetropia.

Surely Mr. Bardsley has been troubling himself over a very simple matter. If bifocal pince-nez are used, every wearer instinctively adjusts them so that his visual lines traverses them normally; and if spectacles are worn, it is a very simple matter to raise the legs a trifle so that the lenses are tilted sufficiently to meet this requirement. As when reading the head is usually inclined 10° to 15° the eyes need not be depressed more than 15° at most.

I am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

A. S. Percival.

17, Claremont Place,
Newcastle-on-Tyne.

OBITUARY.

We regret to announce the death, at the age of 62, of Sir James Mackenzie Davidson, of London, one of the foremost authorities in the world on X-rays, especially in their applicability to ophthalmology. Formerly lecturer on ophthalmology in the University of Aberdeen and ophthalmic surgeon to the Royal Infirmary and the Royal Sick Children's Hospital, he came to London in 1897 and devoted special attention to X-ray work. He will be best remembered for his cross-thread method of localizing foreign bodies by means of X-rays, which, of course, has found its greatest application in the war. The devotion which he paid to this branch of his work impaired his vitality, and the world of science is the poorer by the loss of an inventive mind, and humanity...