least $1 - \alpha$, and the phrase "size $(1 - \alpha)$" following (4.4) of [1] is not meant to imply that the test proposed is a similar region test. Also, starting again from (5.5) of [1], the implied simultaneous confidence statements (5.10) of [1], with a confidence coefficient $\geq 1 - \alpha$, were obtained, and the main objective of [1] was to obtain such confidence statements, while the test for $H_0$ was only of secondary interest.

A question raised by T. W. Anderson, and which, in fact, was originally investigated but temporarily abandoned by me, is whether it would not be more desirable to consider a test with the following intersection region of acceptance for $H_0$:

$$v_{j1} \leq c_{\min}(S_j S_k^{-1}) \leq c_{\max}(S_j S_k^{-1}) \leq v_{j2}, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, k,$$

where $v_{j1}$ and $v_{j2}$, for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, k$, are to be chosen such that this region is of size $1 - \alpha$ under $H_0$. This is the natural extension of the test proposed by Roy [2] for the case $k = 1$, and it formed the starting point of my original investigation that led to [1]. While (B) is preferable to (A) as a test of $H_0$ against certain types of alternatives, because the size of (B) does not depend on the characteristic roots of $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 = \cdots = \Sigma_k = \Sigma$, yet, for $k > 1$, the distribution problem associated with it seemed intractable and, furthermore, my initial attempts to obtain simultaneous confidence statements associated with (B) were not successful. These points are now being more fully investigated. Finally, the test with acceptance region (A) may, against certain alternative hypotheses, be preferable to (B), although even here (A) itself may not be the best possible. This last point is to be more fully developed in a joint paper by S. N. Roy and myself.

I thank T. W. Anderson, who kindly pointed out the need for clarification, and S. N. Roy for his comments and suggestions.
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CORRECTION TO

“THE USE OF SAMPLE QUASI-RANGES IN ESTIMATING POPULATION STANDARD DEVIATION”

BY H. LEON HARTER

Wright Air Development Division

In the paper cited in the title (Ann. Math Stat., Vol. 30 (1959), pp. 980–999), on p. 988, the numerator and the denominator of (2) should be interchanged. This error does not affect the tables or other portions of the text.