PIGNET'S METHOD ADAPTED TO BRITISH STANDARDS.

By CAPTAIN J. A. BALCK,
Royal Army Medical Corps.

Some time ago I published a paper on the value of Pignet's factor as applied to British recruits. A great drawback of the method from our point of view, is of course that it only applies to measurements taken by the metric system. To be of general utility it must be translated into, or adapted to, British weights and measures. Mere translation, i.e., substituting inches for centimetres, and pounds for kilogrammes, will however, not do. The formula as it stands is:—

\[ F = H - (W + C), \]

in which \( H \) represents the height in centimetres, \( W \) the weight in kilogrammes, and \( C \) the chest measurement at greatest expiration again in centimetres, with the result that the smaller \( F \) (i.e., the difference between \( H \) and \( W + C \)) the better the man. Merely substituting English weights and measures would give us negative figures which are always unhandy.

It is obvious that some reconstruction becomes necessary. The form it should take is, I suggest, the following:—

\[ F = (W + C) - H. \]

Of course in this form the greater the factor \( F \) the better the man. When making this change I have also made an alteration in the value of \( C \). It now represents chest measurement at greatest inspiration, which is the one British recruiting standards always use.

In its new shape the scale corresponding to Pignet's runs as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 80</th>
<th>80-90</th>
<th>90-100</th>
<th>100-110</th>
<th>110-120</th>
<th>Over 120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Useless</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I do not claim that the values obtained here are equivalent to those under the same heading in Pignet's scale, but for British recruits they represent a good working guide. Another figure of some importance is the one which a recruit should be expected to attain before being dismissed gymnasiaum. I have found eighty-five one which certainly does not err on the side of severity, and is, I think, the minimum to be expected after six months' training.

I am indebted to Colonel Sawyer, A.D.M.S., for the original suggestion of which this note gives the result, and to Major J. H. Brunskill, R.A.M.C., for his help in arriving at the formula finally selected.