

## Amendments and Corrections

### ‘Nonparametric maximum likelihood estimation of the structural mean of a sample of curves’

BY D. GERVINI AND T. GASSER

*Biometrika* (2005), **92**, pp. 801–820

gervini@uwm.edu tgasser@ifspm.unizh.ch

It has been brought to our attention that the implicit expression (6) for the estimator with general warping function had been derived earlier by B. Rønn, in an unpublished technical report of the Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University, Frederiksberg. However, the actual implementation and computation of the estimators are very different in our paper from in the technical report.

[Received September 2006]

### ‘A construction method for orthogonal Latin hypercube designs’

BY DAVID M. STEINBERG AND DENNIS K. J. LIN

dms@post.tau.ac.il dkl5@psu.edu

*Biometrika* (2006), **93**, pp. 279–288

The paper included comparison of a 12-factor, 16-run design to randomly generated Latin hypercube designs and  $U$ -designs, with respect to the properties of their alias matrices. An error in a computer program led to incorrect computation of the properties of the alias matrix of the orthogonal design. A corrected version of Table 2 is provided here. The orthogonal Latin hypercube design still has better properties than the best of 100 random designs, but the differences are less striking than those in our original table.

Table 2 (corrected): Example 1. A comparison of the alias properties of 16-run, 12-factor Latin hypercube designs. For rows associated with the 12 main effects, the table shows the percentage of entries in the two-factor interaction alias matrix  $A_{\text{int}}$  and the pure quadratic alias matrix  $A_{\text{quad}}$  with absolute values that are greater than the listed cut-off values. For the standard Latin hypercube designs and  $U$ -designs results correspond to the best performers from 100 randomly generated designs

Design	Two-factor interactions				Pure quadratics			
	$\geq 0.1$	$\geq 0.2$	$\geq 0.4$	$\geq 0.6$	$\geq 0.1$	$\geq 0.2$	$\geq 0.4$	$\geq 0.6$
Orthogonal LHD	35.0	16.9	4.8	0.0	25.7	13.9	5.6	0.0
Standard LHD	69.3	40.9	9.0	0.4	49.3	35.4	6.3	1.4
$U$ -design	47.3	18.8	5.1	0.5	54.2	26.4	0.7	0.0

LHD, Latin hypercube design

We are grateful to Kwong-Ip Liu of Hong Kong Baptist University for bringing the error to our attention.

[Received September 2006]

**‘Using the periodogram to estimate period in nonparametric regression’**

BY PETER HALL AND MING LI

peter.hall@anu.edu.au ming.li@maths.anu.edu.au

*Biometrika* (2006), **93**, pp. 411–424

Arising from an omitted term in a calculation in the Appendix, variance formulae in the paper should be adjusted. In particular, the constants in the numerators of equations (2·4) and (2·15) should be 6 rather than 18. Variances are, however, still higher than in the case of least-squares estimators. The changes are implied by the following corrections to the Appendix. On p. 423,  $2c\delta\Delta'_{\cos}(\omega^{(k)})$  should be included within braces on lines 11 and 17, and  $2c\delta\Delta'_{\sin}(\omega^{(k)})$  should be added within braces on lines 12 and 18, leading to the extra term  $2cm^{-3/2}\{\Delta'_{\sin}(\omega^{(k)})\gamma'_{\sin} + \Delta'_{\cos}(\omega^{(k)})\gamma'_{\cos}\}$  on line 21. We are grateful to Barry Quinn for drawing our attention to this error.

[Received September 2006]