

route is probably much smaller than that likely to be incurred in the calculation of head-wind components from air-derived navigational winds.

Ospringe,  
61 Mayfair Avenue,  
Bexleyheath,  
Kent

Yours faithfully,  
H. Keeling

#### 'FIVE YEARS' PROGRESS IN MARINE RADAR'

SIR,—Mr. A. L. P. Milwright of A.S.R.E. has kindly pointed out to me an error in my paper 'Five Years' Progress in Marine Radar' (this *Journal*, Vol. VII, p. 59). The error occurs on page 67 in the paragraph headed *Aerial Performance*, where it is stated that 'to avoid losing the target when the ship is rolling, the vertical beam-width may not, by the Ministry of Transport specification, be less than  $20^\circ$  . . .'. It appears that I have fallen into a somewhat common error in assuming that the meaning of Clause 9 of the Ministry's specification can be expressed simply as a beam-width. It appears that the real significance of this clause is that the performance of the set must not fall below that required by Clause 3 over an arc of  $20^\circ$  in the vertical plane. This, in turn, means that a radar set in which the performance is higher than the minimum specified may have a vertical beam-width (between  $\frac{1}{2}$ -power points) of considerably less than  $20^\circ$  and yet meet the requirements of Clause 9. In some modern British radars the vertical beam-width might be reduced to  $10$ – $15^\circ$ .

I think it is important that this error should be corrected in print.

Radio Advisory Service,  
Cory Building,  
117 Fenchurch Street,  
London, E.C.3

Yours faithfully,  
F. J. Wylie

---

#### ERRATUM

In Table II of Captain Wylie's paper (Vol. VII, p. 64) column v should indicate that the Marconi Mk. IV radar has a differentiator.