

The generally lower results quoted in this work compared to ours can be explained by the collection procedure. It is known that a bag collection system causes distortion of the puff resulting in long puff duration and hence lower CO concentration.

It is a pity that puff N<sup>2</sup>s are not quoted in Table 2 since Craven "A" filters + Peter Steyverscot H.S.F. give significantly higher results than the rest.

Of particular interest are the differences between R.P.M.B. and V.I.M.B. for Craven "A" filters and possibly Country life. These results are much more important and significant than the H.S.F. result but no mention is made of them. Unless there is a simple explanation further work to determine the reason for the difference would seem very worthwhile. (a simple explanation would be paper porosity).

The 50% S.M.C. result on p. 10 affords nothing of comment since this is probably significant. The work in R.P.M.B. has been inconclusive on N.C.F. but S.M.C. certainly does not seem to increase the CO and may reduce it.

How about hypoxia error?  
an

107470044