By dividing the numbers in the first table by the corresponding numbers of the second, we obtain a fraction which represents the relative density of distribution of the group on the basis of unity. Thus, in the case of the Tetractinellida, the number in the first column of both tables is 16, so that the quotient to be placed in Table III. will be 1.

TABLE III.

				$\begin{array}{c} \text{I.} \\ \text{050} \\ \text{Fathoms.} \end{array}$	II. 51–200 Fathoms.	III. 201–1000 Fathoms.	IV. Above 1000 Fathoms.
Tetractinellida, .				1	1.122	0.6	0.11
Hexactinellida,			.		1	1.088	0.581
Monaxonida, .	• .		.	1	0.8	0.6424	0.126
Ceratosa, .				1	0.3	0.1231	****
Calcarea, .		•		1	0.7707	0.1	

These comparisons are rendered clearer by representing the proportion between the numbers of the columns by multiples instead of fractions of unity. Thus in the fourth column instead of 0.11 we place 1, and increase the contents of the other columns in proportion.

TABLE IV.

			I. 0–50 Fathoms.	II. 51–200 Fathoms.	III. 201–1000 Fathoms.	IV. Above 1000 Fathoms.
Tetractinellida, .			9	11	5.4	1
Hexactinellida,	•.	•	•••	1.72	1.872	1
Monaxonida, .	•	٠	7.92	6.336	5.048	1
Ceratosa, .			8.1	2.437	1	
Calcarea, .		•	10	7.707	1	

Somewhat is also to be learnt from the proportion of stations at which successful hauls were made. I therefore add a table in which the absolute number of successful stations is given in one line, followed by another in which the ratio of the number of successful hauls to the actual number of hauls made is given; this ratio in the fourth column being taken as unity, the ratios in the remaining columns are shown as multiples of it, as follows:—