COMPARATIVE CORRELATIONS OF foF2
WITH "IONOSPHERIC SUNSPOT-NUMBER"
AND ORDINARY SUNSPOT-NUMBER
Terr Mag 53(1) 79 (1948)
M Lindeman Phillips

The elimination of data for 1945 and later from the compilation for correlation-coefficient,

however, does not result in significantly closer approximation of the two correlation-coefficients,

so that the better correlation of foF2 with "ionospheric sunspot-numbers" seems to occur not

because both "ionospherie sunspot-numbers" and foF2 depart similarly from a linear relation with

Wolf sunspot-numbers, but because of either the fact that "ionospheric sunspot-numbers" are more

consistent than are ordinary sunspot-numbers, or, more fundamentally, that worldwide ionospheric

variation is more consistent than is the appearance of sunspots.

JGR 57(4) 473 (1952):
THE DIFFERENCES IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IONOSPHERIC CRITICAL FREQUENCIES AND SUNSPOT NUMBER FOR

DIFFERENT SUNSPOT CYCLES
BY S. M. OSTROW AND M. PoKempner:
Analysis of data for Washington and Watheroo indicates differences in the relationship between foF2

and sunspot number for the
current and preceding sunspot cycles. The sunspot number is therefore not entirely satisfactory as

an index for ionospheric variations. Consequently, ionospheric data for the current cycle only

should be used in preparing ionospheric radio propagation predictions whenever possible.

Waldmeier JGR 64(9) 1347 (1959)
This [1957] is by far the highest sunspot-maximum on record since the beginning of the Zurich

statistics in 1749. This high activity is produced by a very large

number of small and middle-sized

groups, whereas groups of exceptionally large dimensions were completely missing. Table 2 gives the

numbers of sunspot-groups on each day for the year 1958. The yearly mean of the group-numbers is

14.9 against 14.3 in 1957. Whereas the sunspot-numbers decreased by 3 per cent from 1957 to 1958,

the group-numbers increased by 4 per cent.