

based, multidimensional scaling method may be selected along with a higher degree, inner-product based, projection pursuit method. If the same qualitative features are present in such "orthogonal" analyses, the user can be more sure that the corresponding effects are real ones and not just an artifact of a particular method employed.

Finally, I wonder to what extent the OMEGA system could fruitfully be developed along the general lines very briefly sketched in my published discussion of Van der Heijden, de Falguerolles and De Leeuw (1989, page 275). The thrust of those remarks was in favor of a general constructive interplay between two broad approaches to data analysis: the exploratory, graphical approach and the confirmatory, modeling approach. Could OMEGA benefit from blending with the second of these? Some particular possibilities that come to mind are: brushing points that are influential for particular aspects of the analysis; examining the robustness of the methods proposed; borrowing ideas from the *model* choice literature in the present *method* choice context; and filtering to remove uninteresting model effects to see more clearly what remains (the thrust of the original paper).

REMARKS ON THE EXAMPLE

The following remarks concern "color strength: unexpected nonpredictability" (Section 5.2):

To what extent is the reduction from 29 to 5 variables in the PCA-COV analysis a reflection of dominant variation of these variables compared to the rest? Recalling the discussion in Section 3.1, it would be helpful to know to what extent the results go through in a PCA-COR analysis.

The (3, 5) and (4, 5) scatterplots in Figures 6 and 7 seem to reveal an outlier with low STRVI and STRREM values for its STRTRA figure.

The authors note two oddly placed batches in Figure 8: numbers 84 and 93. Could it be that these are ill-fitting points in the dominant PCA plane (perhaps with high loadings on a particular minor component)?

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

- AMARI, S.-I. (1985). *Differential Geometric Methods in Statistics. Lecture Notes in Statist.* **28**. Springer, New York.
- AMARI, S.-I., BARNDORFF-NIELSEN, O. E., KASS, R. E., LAURITZEN, S. L. and RAO, C. R. (1987). *Differential Geometry in Statistical Inference*. IMS, Hayward, Calif.
- BARNDORFF-NIELSEN, O. E. (1988). *Parametric Statistical Models and Likelihood. Lecture Notes in Statist.* **50**. Springer, New York.
- COPPI, R. and BOLASCO, S. (1989). *Multiway Data Analysis*. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- CRITCHLEY, F. (1985). Influence in principal components analysis. *Biometrika* **72** 627–636.
- CRITCHLEY, F. (1987). Graphical presentation of data: A review and some recent developments. Presented at the 17th European Meeting of Statisticians, Thessaloniki.
- CRITCHLEY, F. (1988). On certain linear mappings between inner-product and squared-distance matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.* **105** 91–107.
- DODSON, C. T. J. (1987). *Geometrisation of Statistical Theory*. ULDM Publications, Univ. Lancaster, England.
- GREENACRE, M. J. (1984). *Theory and Applications of Correspondence Analysis*. Academic, London.
- LEBART, L., MORINEAU, A. and WARWICK, K. M. (1984). *Multivariate Descriptive Statistical Analysis: Correspondence Analysis and Related Techniques for Large Matrices*. Wiley, New York.
- MEULMAN, J. (1986). *A Distance Approach to Nonlinear Multivariate Analysis*. DSWO, Leiden.
- RAMSAY, J. O. (1988). Monotone regression splines in action (with discussion). *Statist. Sci.* **3** 425–461.
- VAN DER BURG, E. (1988). *Nonlinear Canonical Correlation and Some Related Techniques*. DSWO, Leiden.
- VAN DER HEIJDEN, P. G. M., DE FALGUEROLLES, A. and DE LEEUW, J. (1989). A combined approach to contingency table analysis using correspondence analysis and log-linear analysis (with discussion). *Appl. Statist.* **38** 249–292.

Comment

N. I. Fisher

I am grateful for the opportunity to comment on this interesting piece of work. I regret that the rude

N. I. Fisher is Program Leader, Applied and Industrial Statistics, in the CSIRO Division of Mathematics and Statistics. His mailing address is CSIRO DMS, PO Box 218, Lindfield NSW 2070, Australia.

interjection of the Australian holiday season has prevented me from giving the paper the attention it deserves, so I shall confine my remarks to a couple of specific aspects relating to graphical testing and estimation.

The authors are confronted by a common problem: the sheer volume of data sets being presented to the in-house statisticians means that the treatment of all but a very small number of sets must necessarily be