REFERENCES

BREIMAN, L., FRIEDMAN, J. H., OLSHEN, R. A., and STONE, C. J. (1984). *Classification and Regression Trees.* Wadsworth, Belmont, CA.

DIACONIS, P. (1985). Theories of data anlysis from magical thinking through mathematical statistics. In *Exploring Tables, Trends and Shapes* (D. C. Hoaglin, F. Mosteller, and J. W. Tukey, eds.). Wiley, New York.

DIACONIS, P. and FRIEDMAN, J. H. (1983). *M* and *N* plots. *Recent Advances in Statistics* (M. H. Rizvi, J. Rustagi, and D. Siegmund, eds.). 425–447, Academic, New York.

FRIEDMAN, J. H. (1977). A variable metric decision rule for nonparametric classification. *IEEE Trans. Comput.* **C-26** 404–408.

FRIEDMAN, J. H. and RAFSKY, L. C. (1979). Multivariate generalizations of the Wald-Wolfowitz and Smirnov two-sample tests. *Ann. Statist.* **7** 697–717.

FRIEDMAN, J. H. and RAFSKY, L. C. (1981). Graphics for the multivariate two-sample problem. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **76** 277–287.

GORDON, L. and OLSHEN, R. A. (1978). Asymptotically efficient solutions to the classification problem. *Ann. Statist.* **6** 515–533.

KOLATA, G. (1982). Computer graphics comes to statistics. *Science* **217** 919–920.

REAVEN, G. M. and MILLER, R. G. (1979). An attempt to define the nature of chemical diabetes using a multidimensional analysis. *Diabetologia* **16** 17–24.

SYMONS, M. J. (1981). Clustering criteria and multivariate normal mixtures. *Biometrics* **37** 35–43.

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305

L. A. SHEPP

AT&T Bell Laboratories

I would like to discuss the many interesting similarities and differences between projection pursuit (PP) and computed tomography (CT) as emphasized by Professor Huber.

First, just in case PP becomes a successful tool in exploratory data analysis (EDA), I hasten to point out that CT has indeed had some influence on PP. Indeed, the basic (to PP) concept of ridge function is an idea which was introduced to CT already in Logan's paper in the *Duke Math. J.*, 1975. The idea of superposing filtered projections, which is the basis of all algorithms used in commercial CT, is analogous to superposing filtered projections in PP even though "filtered" in PP is used in the sense that all but the "interesting few of the projections" are discarded while in CT "filtered" means convolution of each projection with a "filter function" (this is also due to Logan). Actually PP seems even closer to emission CT than to transmission CT—see Vardi, Shepp and Kaufman (1985), *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **80** 8–37.

Emphasizing next the differences between PP and CT for accuracy of discussion, we note:

(a) Parallel linear projections in PP are not fundamental—one could easily imagine nonparallel projections, fan-beam, or even curvilinear projections rather than straight line projections. Thus in PP the density is sampled,