

## Re: Underestimating 'r'

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-10/msg00347.html>

---

- *From:* [an588@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:an588@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Catherine Woodgold)
  - *Date:* Wed, 12 Oct 2005 00:29:21 -0400 (EDT)
- 

"Perplexed in Peoria" ([jimmenegay@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jimmenegay@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)) writes:

> A good policy. And the only reason Tim and I disagreed with you  
> is that you seemed to be suggesting that 'r' was a symbol that  
> hadn't yet been defined. In the current context, it has been  
> defined. (Perhaps too often!)

I think I hadn't seen the definition, that's the trouble.  
Still not sure that I've seen a definition of r in this  
newsgroup. My memory isn't perfect, that's another problem.  
If there's a reasonably precise usually accepted definition  
of r, I'll try to remember to use a different symbol  
(R, perhaps) if I use a different definition.

—

Cathy Woodgold

[http://www.ncf.ca/~an588/par\\_home.html](http://www.ncf.ca/~an588/par_home.html)

We are all Iraqis now.

---

• *References:*

- ◆ [\*Underestimating 'r'\*](#)  
◇ *From:* Tim Tyler

- Prev by Date: [\*Re: Most important paper in evolutionary biology\*](#)
- Next by Date: [\*Re: Underestimating 'r'\*](#)
- Previous by thread: [\*Re: Underestimating 'r'\*](#)
- Next by thread: [\*Re: Underestimating 'r'\*](#)
- Index(es):
  - ◆ [\*Date\*](#)
  - ◆ [\*Thread\*](#)