		SUBJECTIVE SCORES				
		5	4	3	2	1
CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	$r > +0.80$	18	15	4	0	0
	0.70 — 0.80	10	19	17	5	1
	0.46 — 0.69	6	13	16	8	4
	0.25 — 0.45	1	5	5	5	1
	$r < +0.25$	4	1	7	2	1

Table 1. Contingency table, correlation coefficients vs subjective scores. 168 cases.

that is, the intervals are chosen so as to make approximately equal the frequency totals of Row 1 and Column 1, Row 2 and Column 2, and so on.

It is apparent from inspecting Table 1 that the sample is skewed. The total of frequencies on either side of the upper-left-to-lower-right diagonal are approximately equal, which is an outcome of the way in which class intervals have been specified. Looking, however, at the extremes of the distribution (the lower left and upper right corners of the table as shown by the diagonal lines), it is seen that there are more prognoses for which the correlation was very low and the subjective score very high, than vice versa. In 4 cases, for example, the progs were given a top score yet they showed a correlation of height change of less then +0.25. At the other extreme, on the other hand, there were no cases when the correlation was above +0.80 and the forecasts were graded below a 3.

Clearly, the low correlation *between* the sets of verifications (+0.35) is attributable to the dispersion of frequencies in Table 1. It is also suggested, however, that this low correlation is due more to those cases in which the height change correlation was very low but the score was very high, than to those cases in which the height change correlation was very high and the score low.

The implication here is of some interest, namely, that although the correlation between forecast and observed height changes may be criticized as a measure of prognostic accuracy, or prognostic value, it does tend to act as a lower limit as far as concerns measuring the similarity between the prog and the observed chart. Thus the similarity tends to be at least as good as is indicated by the correlation coefficient and in fact may be much better.

William H. Best
University of Stockholm

Present assignment: Headquarters
2d Weather Wing, USAF
Furstenfeldbruck Air Base

REFERENCES

BERGTHORSSON, P., DÖÖS, B. R., FRYKLUND, HAUG, O., LINDQUIST, R., 1955: Routine Forecasting With the Barotropic Model, *Tellus* **7**, pp. 272—274.

ERRATA

Volume 7, number 4.

Page	Column	Line	Should read
466	2	eq. (29)	$\frac{D_1 f}{dt} = \mathbf{v}_2 \nabla_h f + \mathbf{v}_\alpha \cdot \nabla_h f$
469	1	eq. (47)	$-A(\psi, s) = \ldots$
472	1	eq. (69)	$2\Omega_z \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} - g \ln \vartheta = k(z, t)$
472	2	6 from bottom	$\nabla_h \times \mathbf{v}_\alpha \mathbf{k} = 0$