stay long in business if he quoted a range of odds before every race. Should genetic counselors be any different?

ANDREW D. CAROTHERS
MRC Human Genetics Unit
Western General Hospital
Edinburgh

References

Weeks DE, Ott J (1989) Risk calculations under heterogeneity. Am J Hum Genet 45:819–821

Am. J. Hum. Genet. 47:166, 1990

Reply to Dr. Carothers: Support Intervals for Genetic Risks

To the Editor:

Dr. Carothers points out an interesting aspect of our paper, and we appreciate his interest in our contribution. We are glad that he does not mean to argue for one or the other school of probabilistic inference, so we would like to focus on his major point, i.e., whether calculating a support interval for a genetic risk is meaningful. We strongly feel it is, as we also feel that genetic counselors should be different from bookmakers at horse races. The bookmaker is trying to maximize his returns over a series of many trials, while the counselor is concerned with one potentially irreversible decision with serious consequences. If a bookmaker makes a drastic mistake today, he'll make up for it tomorrow.

People who administer genetic tests and calculate genetic risks are often concerned about the reliability of the risk figures; they wonder—and rightly so—how much the risk depends on the variability of parameters such as the recombination fraction, gene frequencies, etc. At present, such parameter estimates are often used in risk calculation as if they were known without error. The underlying uncertainties in any estimate can only be adequately reflected in the form of a support or confidence interval, not in a single-point estimate obtained by integrating out such uncertainties. Why should a risk estimate be treated differently than any other estimate? Perhaps because it is a probability? But so is the proportion of probands who carry a certain gene, for which Dr. Carothers apparently sees support intervals as being meaningful.

Our plea for calculating support intervals for genetic risks is not so much addressed to the lay person as to the responsible counselor. If a risk of, say, 85% has a support interval of 40%–92%, one would surely counsel in a different way than if the support interval were only 82%–88%.

DANIEL E. WEEKS AND JURG OTT
New York State Psychiatric Institute
and Colombia University
New York

Am. J. Hum. Genet. 47:166–167, 1990

Association of Pigmentary Anomalies with Chromosomal and Genetic Mosaicism and Chimerism

To the Editor:

We agree with the points made by Thomas et al. (1989) on the relation between chromosomal mosaicism and skin pigmentary changes. Indeed, we published a closely similar analysis last year (Donnai et al. 1988), and we were disappointed to see our paper referenced in a way which would lead your readers to suppose it contained (*a*) merely two among many case reports and (*b*) the wrong idea that hypomelanosis of Ito (HI) was seen only with diploid-triploid mixoploidy. We would, however, like to take the opportunity to acknowledge the abstract by Flannery et al. (1985), which predates our first publication on this topic (Donnai et al. 1986). We were unaware of this abstract until we read the paper by Thomas et al. The common conclusion is that HI is a symptom and not a single syndrome.

We would like to make three further points about HI which are not covered by Thomas et al. First, not all cases of HI have detectable chromosomal mosaicism; our own case 3 (Donnai et al. 1988) did not, Hall's editorial (Hall 1989) mentions another (though apparently only lymphocytes were tested; it is important to check skin too), and we are aware of other cases which have been thoroughly investigated without finding mosaicism. These cases are expected, nevertheless, to have two cell populations. There may be undetected chromosomal mosaicism or mosaicism for a cytologically invisible mutation. Happle, who has contributed so much to this field, has already made this suggestion in relation to McCune-Albright syndrome (Happle 1986). He did not, as Thomas et al. imply, suggest that only Lyonization can produce Blaschko's lines.

Second, it is not clear why pigmentary differences are seen. The abnormal karyotypes seen are not, when