BOOK REVIEWS

erties. One property is that the tests can easily be inverted to obtain confidence bounds. Another is that the method of test construction leads naturally into a set of simultaneous confidence bounds; that is, in 95 percent (say) of such experiments each confidence bound in the set will contain the true value of its corresponding parametric function. Then he discusses the power of the tests (and thus the "shortness" of the confidence bounds) and obtains lower bounds for the power functions, and finally, develops the confidence bounds associated with the class of tests. These include confidence bounds on means and linear functions of means, on the characteristic roots of variance-covariance matrices, and on regression functions.

In the last chapter Roy discusses the application of the same class of tests to multivariate categorical data. Here he makes the important but often neglected distinction between a classification whose marginal totals are fixed in advance and one whose marginal totals are random variables. The distinction does not affect the test criterion but rather determines the class of alternative hypotheses to be considered. It is also useful in pointing up analogies between contingency table problems and analysis of variance problems.

The proofreading of the book is less than adequate, particularly considering the small amount of redundancy in a mathematical equation. The reader who, like the reviewer, is annoyed to find that he is reading a continued story will hope that the wait for the "later monograph" which is promised so often throughout the book will not be too long.

It is not likely that the ultimate consumer of statistical methods will find this book worth his while. But the psychological statistician interested in multivariate problems will profit from a careful study of this work.

J. E. KEITH SMITH

Lincoln Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

## CORRECTION

An erratum which appeared in *Psychometrika*, Volume 24, p. 404, December, 1959, unfortunately included a typographical error. The final symbol should read  $q_2$ , not  $p_2$ . Thus the erratum would read as follows.

In Cureton, Edward E., Note on  $\phi/\phi_{max}$ . *Psychometrika*, 1959, 24, 89–92, the first sentence of paragraph 2, page 89, should read "It is well known that  $\phi$  can equal +1 only if  $p_1 = p_2$ , and that it can equal -1 only if  $p_1 = q_2$  ([1], p. 324; [2], p. 342)."

The editorial staff joins the William Byrd Press in promising more diligently to "mind our p's and q's."