

As Mr Bradfield points out, even more interesting are the reported discrepancies which arise in flaw evaluation with respect to flat-ended hole targets when the frequency is changed. We have carried out a systematic investigation of this effect, which became apparent at an early stage in our work, and a paper is projected on the subject for publication later in 1969. It has been found that the discrepancies are very marked for certain types of flaw, and also that they can be quite different, both in character and amount, for different types of flaw in different materials. Thus a flattened silicate inclusion in a steel forging was equated to a 0.080in diameter flat-ended hole at  $5\frac{1}{4}$  MHz and to a 0.030in flat-ended hole at  $2\frac{1}{4}$  MHz. This discrepancy corresponds to a difference of 18dB. In contrast to the above result, a flaw in a titanium forging, as yet unknown in metallurgical character, gave reflection equality with a 0.047in flat-ended hole at  $5\frac{1}{4}$  MHz and with a 0.125in flat-ended hole at  $2\frac{1}{4}$  MHz. The difference in this case is 14dB and is in the opposite sense to the results in steel.

The results quoted above and many of a similar nature have made it quite clear that one of the vital parameters which must be known is probe operating frequency. Any attempt at flaw size standardization in terms of an artificial target must include the determination, by practical measurement, of the effective frequency of the probe/flaw detector com-

bination. This is a factor which has been given too little attention in the past and which most of our commercially made flaw detectors (with one recently publicized exception) do nothing to assist.

J. D. Hislop  
Divisional Quality Engineer (NDT)  
Rolls Royce Ltd  
Aero Engine Division  
PO Box 31  
Derby, DE2 8BJ  
England

## ERRATUM

### GENERAL H. L. DE LEIRIS

We are very sorry that, in the article on COFREND in the November 1968 issue of Non-Destructive Testing, a mistranslation caused General H. L. de Leiris to be inadvertently referred to as 'the general engineer of Leiris'. General de Leiris is of course a distinguished French engineer, and we offer him our sincere apologies for this error.

## CALL FOR PAPERS— ULTRASONICS FOR INDUSTRY 1969

October 7, 8 St Ermin's Hotel, London

Papers will be welcomed on all industrial aspects of ultrasonics—recent advances, new devices and applications. These include transducers, imaging, non-destructive testing, communication and control, chemical processing, influence on materials, effect on friction, cavitation, cleaning, eroding and machining and medical ultrasonics.

The programme will include a number of invited papers.

The deadline for contributed papers is 30 June 1969. Abstracts must be submitted by this date to the Conference Organizer, Ultrasonics, Iliffe House, High Street, Guildford, Surrey, England. Abstracts should be typed in double spacing and two copies should be provided: the abstract should include title, authors, affiliations, footnote, references. Authors may submit additional information to assist in evaluation of the content of the paper.

## INDEX TO ADVERTISERS

AGA (UK) Ltd	54
Agfa-Gevaert Ltd	51
Automation Industries Inc	14
Automation Industries UK	50
Dawe Instruments Ltd	2
Deakin Instrumentation Ltd	58
Forster Instruments Ltd	21
Industrial Inspection Ltd	58
Inspection Instruments (NDT) Ltd	54
3M Company Ltd	18
Magnaflux Ltd	22
MEL Equipment Co Ltd	12, 13, outside back cover
NDT Info	52
Nuclear Enterprises Ltd	20
Pantak Ltd	16
Sonatest Ltd	Inside front cover
Vitosonics Ltd	6
Watson & Sons (Electro-Medical) Ltd	23
Wells-Krautkramer Ltd	8