The journal in reference [6] should be *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* instead of *Ann. Math. Stat.*

CORRECTIONS TO "ON BALANCING IN FACTORIAL EXPERIMENTS"

By B. V. Shah

University of Bombay

In the paper cited in the title (*Ann. Math. Stat.*, Vol. 29(1958), pp. 766–779), on p. 766, lines 23–26, the sentence should read as follows: "The set up assumed is that yield of a plot in the jth block having ith treatment is $\mu + \alpha_j + t_i + \epsilon_{ij}$, where μ is over all effect, α_j is the effect of the jth block, t_i is the effect of the ith treatment and ϵ_{ij} is the experimental error."

On p. 776, line 2, change "any contrast" to "any normalised contrast".

On p. 777, in equations (7.7), (7.8) and (7.9), change "$(-1)^{q-1}$" to "$(-1)^{q-i}$".

I am indebted to a referee of a subsequent paper for pointing out these corrections.

CORRECTION TO "A TABLE FOR COMPUTING TRIVARIATE NORMAL PROBABILITIES"

By George P. Steck

Sandia Corporation

The following correction should be made to the paper of the above title (*Ann. Math. Stat.*, Vol. 29 (1958), pp. 780–800):

Pages 790–799: replace "m" by "h" in the table headings.

CORRECTIONS TO "A GENERALIZATION OF THE GLIVENKO-CANTELLI THEOREM"

By Howard G. Tucker

University of California, Riverside

The paper cited above (*Ann. Math. Stat.*, Vol. 30 (1959), pp. 828–830) contains several errors for which corrections are given below.

Inequality (4) should read

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} F_n(X_{j-1,k}) I_{A_j} \leqq F_n(x) \leqq \sum_{j=1}^{k} F_n(X_{jk} - 0) I_{A_j} \tag{4}$$

Inequality (6) should be replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} F(x \mid \mathfrak{Z}) - F_n(x) &\leqq \sum_{j=1}^{k} (F(X_{jk} - 0 \mid \mathfrak{Z}) - F_n(X_{j-1,k})) I_{A_j} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{k} (F(X_{jk} - 0 \mid \mathfrak{Z}) - F(X_{j-1,k} \mid \mathfrak{Z})) I_{A_j} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{k} (F(X_{j-1,k} \mid \mathfrak{Z}) - F_n(X_{j-1,k})) I_{A_j} \\ &\leqq \max_{1 \leqq j \leqq k} \mid F_n(X_{jk}) - F(X_{jk} \mid \mathfrak{Z}) \mid + 1/k. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Inequality (7) should be replaced by

$$F(x \mid \mathfrak{Z}) - F_n(x) \geqq -\max_{1 \leqq j \leqq k} \mid F_n(X_{jk} - 0) - F(X_{jk} - 0) \mid \mathfrak{Z}) \mid - 1/k. \tag{7}$$

Inequality (8) should be replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} \mid F_n(x) - F(x \mid \mathfrak{Z}) \mid \leqq 1/k + \max_{1 \leqq j \leqq k} \{ \mid F_n(X_{jk} - 0) \\ - F(X_{jk} - 0 \mid \mathfrak{Z}) \mid, \mid F_n(X_{jk}) - F(X_{jk} \mid \mathfrak{Z}) \mid \}. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Immediately after inequality (8) the following sentence should be added: In a way similar to the proof on the bottom of page 829 one may easily verify that $P[F_n(X_{jk} - 0) \underset{n}{\rightarrow} F(X_{jk} - 0 \mid \mathfrak{Z})] = 1$.

CORRECTION TO "ON THE THEORY OF BAN ESTIMATES"[1]

By Robert A. Wijsman

University of Illinois

I am greatly indebted to Dr. Lucien LeCam for calling to my attention an error in the proof of Theorem 1 of the paper cited in the title (*Ann. Math. Stat.* Vol. 30 (1959), pp. 185–191). The transition from (12) to (13) is in general not justified. Worse, the theorem itself is false in general, as can be shown with a counter example. In order to remedy the situation, the assumptions have to be strengthened. This can be done either on the distributions of the Z_n, or on the estimator $\hat{\theta}$. As an example of the first, if the Z_n have densities which (when normalized) converge a.e. to the limiting normal density, then the transition

[1] Work supported by the National Science Foundation.