SLOVENSKI STANDARD
SIST ISO 5725-6:2003/C1:2003

01-junij-2003

Toļ nost (pravilnost in natanļ nost) merilnih metod in rezultatov - 6. del : Uporaba vrednosti za toļ nost v praksi ; tehniļ ni popravek 1

Accuracy (trueness and precision) of measurement methods and results -- Part 6: Use in practice of accuracy values

Exactitude (justesse et fidélité) des résultats et méthodes de mesure -- Partie 6: Utilisation dans la pratique des valeurs d'exactitude

Ta slovenski standard je istoveten z: **ISO 5725-6:1994/Cor 1:2001**

ICS:

03.120.30	Uporaba statistiļ nih metod	Application of statistical methods
17.020	Meroslovje in merjenje na splošno	Metrology and measurement in general

SIST ISO 5725-6:2003/C1:2003 **en**

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD ISO 5725-6:1994
TECHNICAL CORRIGENDUM 1

Published 2001-10-15

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION • МЕЖДУНАРОДНАЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ ПО СТАНДАРТИЗАЦИИ • ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DE NORMALISATION

Accuracy (trueness and precision) of measurement methods and results —

Part 6:
Use in practice of accuracy values

TECHNICAL CORRIGENDUM 1

Exactitude (justesse et fidélité) des résultats et méthodes de mesure —
Partie 6: Utilisation dans la pratique des valeurs d'exactitude

RECTIFICATIF TECHNIQUE 1

Technical Corrigendum 1 to International Standard ISO 5725-6:1994 was prepared by Technical Committee ISO/TC 69, *Applications of statistical methods*, Subcommittee SC 6, *Measurement methods and results*.

Page 35, Table 14

Replace Table 14 with the following table:

ICS 03.120.30 **Ref. No. ISO 5725-6:1994/Cor.1:2001(E)**

Table 14 — Values of $\rho(\nu_A, \nu_B, \alpha, \beta)$ or $\phi(\nu_A, \nu_B, \alpha, \beta)$ for α = 0,05 and β = 0,05

ν_B	ν_A																	
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	25	50	200
6	4,99	4,64	4,39	4,21	4,07	3,95	3,86	3,79	3,72	3,67	3,62	3,58	3,54	3,51	3,48	3,37	3,17	3,02
7	4,69	4,35	4,11	3,93	3,79	3,68	3,59	3,52	3,45	3,40	3,35	3,31	3,28	3,25	3,22	3,11	2,91	2,77
8	4,48	4,14	3,90	3,73	3,59	3,48	3,40	3,32	3,26	3,21	3,16	3,12	3,09	3,06	3,03	2,93	2,72	2,58
9	4,32	3,99	3,75	3,58	3,44	3,34	3,25	3,18	3,12	3,06	3,02	2,98	2,94	2,91	2,89	2,78	2,58	2,44
10	4,19	3,86	3,63	3,46	3,33	3,22	3,13	3,06	3,00	2,95	2,91	2,87	2,83	2,80	2,77	2,67	2,47	2,33
11	4,09	3,77	3,54	3,37	3,23	3,13	3,04	2,97	2,91	2,86	2,81	2,78	2,74	2,71	2,68	2,58	2,38	2,24
12	4,01	3,69	3,46	3,29	3,16	3,05	2,97	2,90	2,84	2,78	2,74	2,70	2,67	2,64	2,61	2,51	2,31	2,16
13	3,94	3,62	3,39	3,22	3,09	2,99	2,90	2,83	2,77	2,72	2,68	2,64	2,60	2,57	2,55	2,44	2,24	2,10
14	3,88	3,56	3,34	3,17	3,04	2,94	2,85	2,78	2,72	2,67	2,62	2,59	2,55	2,52	2,49	2,39	2,19	2,04
15	3,83	3,52	3,29	3,12	2,99	2,89	2,80	2,73	2,67	2,62	2,58	2,54	2,51	2,47	2,45	2,34	2,14	1,99
16	3,79	3,47	3,25	3,08	2,95	2,85	2,76	2,69	2,63	2,58	2,54	2,50	2,47	2,43	2,41	2,30	2,10	1,95
17	3,75	3,44	3,21	3,05	2,92	2,81	2,73	2,66	2,60	2,55	2,50	2,46	2,43	2,40	2,37	2,27	2,07	1,92
18	3,72	3,41	3,18	3,02	2,89	2,78	2,70	2,63	2,57	2,52	2,47	2,43	2,40	2,37	2,34	2,24	2,03	1,88
19	3,69	3,38	3,15	2,99	2,86	2,75	2,67	2,60	2,54	2,49	2,44	2,41	2,37	2,34	2,31	2,21	2,01	1,85
20	3,67	3,35	3,13	2,96	2,83	2,73	2,65	2,58	2,52	2,46	2,42	2,38	2,35	2,32	2,29	2,18	1,98	1,83
25	3,57	3,25	3,03	2,87	2,74	2,64	2,55	2,48	2,42	2,37	2,33	2,29	2,25	2,22	2,19	2,09	1,88	1,72
50	3,37	3,07	2,85	2,68	2,55	2,45	2,37	2,30	2,24	2,18	2,14	2,10	2,06	2,03	2,00	1,89	1,67	1,50
200	3,24	2,93	2,71	2,55	2,42	2,32	2,23	2,16	2,10	2,04	2,00	1,96	1,92	1,89	1,86	1,75	1,51	1,29

NOTES

1 $\rho = \frac{\sigma_{rB}}{\sigma_{rA}}$; $\nu_A = p_A(n_A - 1)$; $\nu_B = p_B(n_B - 1)$

2 $\phi = \sqrt{\left[\frac{n_B \sigma_{LB}^2 + \sigma_{rB}^2}{n_A \sigma_{LA}^2 + \sigma_{rA}^2}\right]}$; $\nu_A = p_A - 1$; $\nu_B = p_B - 1$

Page 37, subclause 8.4.9.2.2 a)

Replace *8.4.9.2.2 a)* with the following:

8.4.9.2.2 Both methods are new candidate standard methods

a) **Within-laboratory precision**

$$F_r = \frac{s_{rB}^2}{s_{rA}^2}$$

If

$$F_{\alpha/2}\left(\nu_{rB},\nu_{rA}\right) \leqslant F_r \leqslant F_{(1-\alpha/2)}\left(\nu_{rB},\nu_{rA}\right)$$

there is no evidence that the methods have different within-laboratory precisions;

if

$$F_r < F_{\alpha/2}\left(\nu_{rB},\nu_{rA}\right)$$

there is evidence that method B has better within-laboratory precision than method A;

if

$$F_r > F_{(1-\alpha/2)}\left(\nu_{rB},\nu_{rA}\right)$$

there is evidence that method B has poorer within-laboratory precision than method A.

$F_{\alpha/2}\left(\nu_{rB},\nu_{rA}\right)$ and $F_{(1-\alpha/2)}\left(\nu_{rB},\nu_{rA}\right)$ are the $\alpha/2$- and $(1-\alpha/2)$-quantiles of the F distribution with degrees of freedom of numerator ν_{rB} and denominator ν_{rA}

$$\nu_{rB} = p_B\left(n_B - 1\right)$$

$$\nu_{rA} = p_A\left(n_A - 1\right)$$