From well known limit theorems,

\[
\lim_{\lambda \to \infty} A_{\lambda} = \lim_{\lambda \to \infty} \Pr \{X_\lambda \leq \lambda\} = \lim_{\lambda \to \infty} \Pr \left\{ \frac{X_\lambda - \lambda}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \leq 0 \right\} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{-y^2/2} \, dy = \frac{1}{2}.
\]

The second portion of inequality (2) follows directly from (8) and (9). The remainder is a consequence of these, of the fact that \( A_{\alpha, \lambda} \) decreases monotonically from \( A_{\alpha, n} \) to \( A_{\alpha, n+1} \) in the interval \([n, \, n + 1] \), and of

\[
A_{\alpha, n+1} > A_{\alpha, 1} = e^{-1}, \quad \text{for } n = 1, 2, \ldots.
\]

If an additional term is included in the sum, we note that

\[
b_\lambda = \sum_{j=0}^{\lambda+1} \frac{\lambda!}{j!} a_{j} \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{for all } \lambda \geq 0,
\]

since \( b_\lambda > A_{\alpha+1, n+1} \) for \( \lambda \leq n + 1 \). A final reformulation of part of (2) is

\[
\Pr\{X_\lambda \leq \lambda\} > \Pr\{X_\lambda > \lambda\}, \quad \text{all integral } \lambda > 0.
\]
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The existence theorem proven in this note relates to the problem of finding an experimental design leading to the analysis determined by the given rational matrix \( A \) of the normal equations. The matrix \( B \) found by the method used in the proof always has an interpretation as specifying the rational values of some set of regression variables. In the interesting case in which the entries of \( A \) are integers, so are the entries of \( B \), but \( B \) is not in general interpretable as an analysis of variance. The transpose of a matrix \( A \) will be denoted by \( A^T \).

**Theorem.** Let \( A \) be a symmetric positive semidefinite matrix with rational integral entries. There exist a rational integer \( a \) and a matrix \( B \) having rational integral entries such that \( BB^T = a^2 A \).

**Proof.** There exists a nonsingular matrix \( P \) such that \( P^T AP = D \), a diagonal matrix, where \( P \) and \( D \) have rational entries ([1], p. 56). Then \( (P^T)^{-1} \) has rational entries. Let \( a_1 \) be the least common denominator of the entries of \( P^T \), \( a_2 \) of \( (P^T)^{-1} \), and \( a_3 \) of \( D \). Let \( a_1^{1/2} = a_0 a_2 a_3 \). Then \( a_1^{1/2} P^T a_1^{1/2} AP = aD \). If \( A \) is positive semidefinite, then \( aD \) has only positive integers or zeros on its diagonal. Let \( B_1 \) be a \( n \times 4n \) matrix composed of four diagonal \( n \times n \) matrices placed side by side,
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(S_i S_j S_k S_l), such that \( ad_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^4 \kappa_{ik} \), where \( \kappa_{ik} \) is the entry in the \( i \)th column of \( S_k \). This can always be done by the 4 square problem ([2], p. 235). Let \( B = a^{1/2} (P^T)^{-1} B_1 \), then \( B \) has integral entries, since \( B_1 \) and \( a^{1/2}(P^T)^{-1} \) have integral entries. Then

\[ P^T B = a^{1/2} B_1, \quad P^T B B^T P = a B_1 B_1^T = a^2 D, \]

Thus \( B B^T = a(P^T)^{-1} a^{1/2} D a^{1/2} P^{-1} \). But \( A = (P^T)^{-1} D P^{-1} \). Thus \( BB^T = a^2 A \).
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A set \( H \), of \( N \) elements, is mapped into itself by a function \( f \). The most general function takes each point into an arbitrary number of points of the set. A function is said to be random if the \( n \) images of the point \( x \) may with equal probability be any subset of \( n \) points of \( H \). A subset \( h \) of \( H \) is a component of the mapping if it is a minimal subset such that \( f(h) \subset h \) and \( f^{-1}(h) \subset h \). Every mapping \( f \) decomposes \( H \) into a number of disjoint components. The probability distribution of the number of components in a random mapping, where only the numbers of images of each point are known in advance, is obtained. The probability distribution of the number of components is also obtained for a variant case in which the mapping is hollow in the sense that no point maps into itself. The two distributions are obtained through a modification of the King-Jordan-Fréchet formula. For each case two specializations are considered; first, one in which the multiplicity of images is the same for each point of the set, and second, where this common multiplicity is unity (so that the function \( f \) is single-valued). Numerical examples and approximations to the exact distribution are considered. This work was supported by the Office of Naval Research.


It is sometimes of interest to test the hypothesis that the proportion of a given population exceeding a given number \( U \) is \( p_0 \) against the hypothesis that this proportion is \( p_1 \). This testing situation has been called that of testing for one-sided fraction defective. If the population is normal then the problem is to test the hypothesis \( (U - \mu)/\sigma = K_0 \) against the hypothesis \( (U - \mu)/\sigma = K_1 \) . (Here \( \mu \) is the mean, \( \sigma^2 \) the variance, and \( K_i \) the unit-normal deviate exceeded with probability \( p_i \).) A simple translation puts this in the form: \( \mu/\sigma = K_0 \) vs. \( \mu/\sigma = K_1 \). If a sequential test is desired, it is very reasonable to base it on the sequence of Student \( t \) values computed from the first \( n \) observations. Application of the Wald sequential probability-ratio method to this sequence gives a procedure that may be called the WAGR test (after Wald, Arnold, Goldberg, and Rushton). Another sequential test