characters (exclusive of card numbers, etc) were covered by both transcription methods. There were 136 differences between Guy's version and the version finally adapted and 78 differences between Reeds's version and the final version, not counting differences involving only the punctuation marks - and =. Thus, Guy and Reeds had transcription error rates of about .0012 and .0007, respectively. According to a naive (independent transcription errors) model, one might expect less than one lingering error in the portion transcribed by both methods.

The portion of Reeds's version *not* covered by Guy's (65,260 characters) was carefully proofread twice, first the old fashioned way, and then again while a computer-driven speech synthesizer read the transcription aloud. The second stage caught 44 errors, which means an error rate of about .0007; the naive error model again predicts less than one lingering error.

Even without accepting the sanguine predictions of the naive error model, it seems certain that Guy and I have introduced far fewer errors in making our modern computer copy of item 1609 than the FSG originally made in transcribing the VMS.