

same paragraph, may address this point but I do not have access to them.

Separate from the axiomatic approach, many people, including myself, have objected to (2), and the concept of possibility, on the grounds that with it $ev(A \text{ or } B)$ can be calculated from $ev(A)$ and $ev(B)$ without any consideration of the relationship between A and B . This can only be done with probability if A and B are exclusive. Probability requires three numbers adequately to describe the relationship between two hypotheses; possibility uses only two and, for that reason, is often thought to be inadequate. Notice also that possibility lacks an axiomatic basis.

So, I am sorry, I do not support FBST, though you may well have answers to the questions above. If so, I should like to hear them. Your paper does raise some other issues; for example (p.2,l.17) it is not true that the normalized likelihood can replace the posterior because likelihood is not additive, whereas probability is. Bayes factors have similar difficulties; see a paper of mine in *J. Stat. Planning & Inference* **61**, 181-189 (1997). I did not understand what you meant (p.4,l.-15) by "changing the nature of H ". It is often forgotten that θ refers to some feature of the real world and dentists (Table 1), like others, have opinions about reality. It is that reality that influences $Pr(H)$. Why (p.7,l.7) are "conclusions based on p-values" subjective? Frequentists often attack Bayesians for being subjective, claiming that $Pr(\text{data}/\theta)$ and quantities like p-values are objective. Finally, not too seriously, why cite von Foerster's nonsense on p.12, which reads like the pompous rubbish of the structuralists?

You may, after reading the above, think that I have a poor opinion of your paper. Not at all, it is valuable to explore these ideas and to study sharp hypotheses. You have done us all a service and made me think hard and profitably about these ideas, for which I thank you.

How are you these days Carlos? It is a long time since we had such good discussions in São Paulo. Joan and I live very quietly here by the sea and provided all stress is avoided my health is good. I keep up with some statistics and it was a real joy quietly to study your paper. Joan asks me to give her regards to you and your wife, in which I join.

Best wishes,

Dennis