from zero to $\frac{1}{2} \cdot s$. We can put $T_2 = 1$ for all practical purposes in this interval.

3) For a slice of finite extension and thickness the resistivity can be written:

$$\rho = G \frac{V}{I}, \qquad G = \frac{\pi}{\ln 2} \cdot t \cdot T_2 \cdot C \cdot F(t,c), \qquad (29)$$

where

$\frac{\pi}{\ln 2} \cdot t \cdot T_2$ is the afore-mentioned geometric factor for an infinite slice of thickness t, C is the correction factor for the limiting contour, for a slice of thickness $t \ll s$ and

F(t,c) is an additional correction factor depending on both thickness and contour. From section E.3 we realize that F(t,c) may be both smaller and greater than unity. F(t,c) approaches unity in the two limits:

1) $F \to 1$ as $\frac{t}{s} \to 0$, in which case $T_2 \to 1$
2) $F \to 1$ as the slice becomes large, in which case $C \to 1$.

In case 1 the slice is so thin that the current distribution is essentially that found in a sheet, which is the assumption under which C is calculated.
In case 2 the slice is so large that the contour does not effect the current distribution, which is the condition for the validity of T_2.
As a change in current distribution is reflected in a deviation from unity in the corresponding geometry factor, we can conclude:

1) Thin slice.

The sample is so thin, that the thickness correction $T_2(\frac{t}{s})$ is close to unity.

The resistivity may then be written:

$$\rho = G \frac{V}{I}, \qquad G = \frac{\pi}{\ln 2} \cdot t \cdot T_2(\frac{t}{s}) \cdot C \qquad (30)$$

where:
The thickness factor T_2 is given in section D.2.
The contour factor C is given in sections I.1-4 and K.1 for various configurations.
(30) is correct within a few procent, when $t \leqq s$, in